DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 568 95 SP 010 994

TITLE	Teacher Corps Planning Conference: Summary Report.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	184p.; Report of Round Table on Teacher Corps Planning, Belmont Conference Center (Elk Ridge, Maryland, July 23-26, 1974)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Agents; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; *Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Financial Support; Needs Assessment; Planning Commissions; *Program Design; *Program Planning; *Summative Evaluation; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

Participants at this four-day meeting of the Teacher Corps Planning Conference discussed the past function of the Corps and possible future courses. The general outline of the agenda was to look into the substantive fields for Teacher Corps focus and the priority needs in teacher education to which the Teacher Corps should address itself. Project design and support were also under consideration. The financing of the Corps and its relations with Congress were described and discussed at length. The consensus of opinion in regard to the position of the Corps within the structure of the government was that the Teacher Corps should perform as a special world somewhere between that of the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, since much of the original work of the Corps was to carry government-developed educational plans into field development. It was recommended that: (a) some restructuring is required in the training of teachers for the project, in evaluating the trainees, and in obtaining better community and parental support; (b) a program should be provided for placing and supporting trainees and following them up; (c) a comprehensive support service plan should be worked out by the administration; and (d) each proposal should contain a full report on needs assessment. This document is a verbatim account of the discussions of the group. The documents they worked from are not included. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138568

SP

SUMMARY REPORT

TEACHER CORPS

PLANNING CONFERENCE

JULY 23-26, 1974
BELMONT CONFERENCE CENTER
ELK RIDGE, MARYLAND

TEACHER CORPS
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
D/HEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP010 994

TEACHER CORPS PLANNING CONFERENCE

- - -

Round Table
on
Teacher Corps Planning

- - -

Belmont Conference Center
Maryland

23 July, 1974

CONTENTS

Page

Participants ii

July 23, 1974 1

July 24, 1974 69

July 25, 1974 123

July 26, 1974 155

TEACHER CORPS PLANNING CONFERENCE

BELMONT - JULY 23-26, 1974

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Robert N. Bush
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Dr. Dean Corrigan
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont 05401

Ms. Georgia Delano
City College of New York
New York, New York 10031

Mr. Glen Enos, Principal
Marcy Open School
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55441

Dr. Alan Gartner
Queens College
New York, New York 10010

Dr. Marilyn Gittell
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, New York 11210

Dr. Paul A. Olson
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68502

Dr. Roger Pankratz
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

Dr. Malcolm Provus
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dr. B. Othanel Smith
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Mr. Harold Snedcof
Rockefeller Brothers Fund
New York, New York 10020

Mr. John Williamson
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

Mr. Sidney Morrison, Principal
Public School #84
New York, New York 10025

Conference Guests

Mr. Richard A. Graham
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Mr. Robert A. Rothbard
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C.

Mr. William Spring
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Ms. Lillian Weber
City College of New York
New York, New York

Mr. Frank Sobol
Programs on Teaching and Curriculum
National Institute of Education

Teacher Corps Participants

Dr. William L. Smith
Director

Mr. Russell A. Wood
Deputy Director

Mr. Robert E. Ardike

Dr. Marie M. Barry

Dr. Caroline J. Gillin

Ms. Theresa K. Mahoney

Mr. Elwyn E. Meenen

Dr. James P. Steffensen

Mr. Clarence C. Walker

CONTENTS

Page

Participants ii

2:00 p.m. Session 1

4:00 p.m. Session 13

8:00 p.m. Session 34

PROCEEDINGS

MR. WOOD: Since Bill Smith is delayed at the Office of Education, I will introduce Robert Bush, designated de facto chairman of the conference, and William Spring, down from Harvard, and with us today.

Bill Spring is probably more responsible than anyone else for the initial legislation for the Teacher Corps, and we hope to get some words from him in a few minutes.

Bob Bush and I feel that we might start by giving everyone a couple of hours to go through additional reading materials which weren't typed or prepared earlier, but they are available now, before we get into the tasks of the conference.

Tess Mahoney, our conference administrator, has passed out a listing of documents, prepared by our staff, or brought in by conference participants.

Bob and I would like to meet in the Ballroom with the designated subgroup chairmen: Sid Morrison, Bunny Smith, Al Gartner, Dean Corrigan, and John Williamson. That meeting will be from 2:30 until 3:00 o'clock.

The only fixed item on the agenda is the Thursday afternoon session from 2:00 until suppertime. It's fixed because other people have been invited to attend. We have to vacate these premises by 3:00 Friday afternoon. Other than that, just go to it; decide how your own talents can best be used in getting what we want to get at the end of the conference. I've put all my remarks up here on the wall; if you don't want to listen to me, you can just read them.

Maybe the documents give a little too much of an operational cast to the conference. We are indeed under pressure to get a program and guidelines, or a request for proposals, ready by November, but that should in no way detract the attention of this conference from the issue which it can best address - Teacher Corps' direction for the next three, or six, or seven years.

There may be basic changes in Teacher Corps legislation; we may get authority for retraining and demonstration projects, in addition to authority for training paraprofessionals. The chances seem better today than yesterday, simply because the House-Senate conference met and reported last night--and resolved their differences on the bussing issue. The question now is what the House will do, what the President will do, and then what the Congress' response will be. But, we're closer than we've been for the last several weeks.

So our concern is, just where should the Teacher Corps be going. We would like you, as you determine what your agenda should be, to be able to give us recommendations on five or six items by Friday.

Substantive fields for Teacher Corps focus--what are the priority needs in teacher education to which the Teacher Corps should address itself?

Project design--what should the projects look like? Is there a difference in projects according to the various fields?

Project support--what type of support systems, technical assistance, or outside assistance--is necessary to be considered for those various fields?

Then evaluation, documentation and dissemination. People have said, "Well, frankly, I don't want to be on evaluation or documentation. I don't want to be in dissemination. I want to be in project design. That's where the action is."

But evaluation, dissemination and documentation are fully as important as any other element of the program if we are indeed going to learn what works and what doesn't work in the Teacher Corps.

And, finally, a process for further planning to lead to more plans and refining of plans for 1976, and the other years.

One approach to these tasks is: "In the light of past Teacher Corps experience, what has it done well; what is it adept at doing; what doesn't it do so well?"

Another approach is: "What are the needs in education, particularly in teacher education? Given the constraints of the legislation we hope to get this year, how best can Teacher Corps address these problems?" You make the decision as to which approach you take. Maybe they should be combined.

I urge you, if you take the course of first examining Teacher Corps or teacher development programs, to ask what the Federal Government can, in fact, do well in teacher development, and then build on it. Examine not only the experience of Teacher Corps, but also the experience of Urban-Rural School Development, and Triple T, and Career Opportunities--these particularly.

We have people here with very good knowledge of all those programs. Paul and Bunnie in Triple T; Bob, the Urban-Rural School Development, Al Gartner in Career Opportunities; and then many people from Teacher Corps

Finally, or next to finally, the legislation. To recapitulate a document you already have, I'll run through the changes we might get in legislation. We expect to get two or three of these things this year, if the present elementary and secondary bill gets through. We have high hopes of getting all the rest next year, on the higher education legislation.

The Teacher Corps' purposes are to increase educational opportunities for kids from low income families and to broaden programs of teacher education, and how to improve training programs in higher education institutions and local educational agencies. It also has a new function--demonstration. The demonstration function has always been implicit, but now there is a Congressional reaffirmation.

Then there is the notion of long-term projects. We do have long-term now by doing consecutive two-year cycles. And we have programs that run four and six years, and some have run more than that.

This would imply that the Congress is recognizing the fact that change doesn't come overnight as our experience with the other programs shows.

Then Teacher Corps membership would expand to include not only the experienced teachers, but all school staff, administrators, paraprofessionals, other specialists on the staff, as well as the basic Teacher Corps teacher interns.

And, then, there is the provision--the word "primarily" has been inserted in the legislation--that the Teacher Corps would remain 90 percent focused on low income.

Sixth, and very important in running this type of program, is technical assistance.

And seventh, 10 percent of program funds would be set aside for monitoring, evaluation, planning and dissemination. This is unique in the Office of Education, certainly unique for the Teacher Corps. We have always struggled along with what funds we could get out of a salary and expenses appropriation--in competition with all the other programs in the Office of Education, no matter whether they were block grant or other types of programs. We didn't get recognition that a discretionary program is really a labor intensive activity, not one that you can put out by computer.

Many of the problems under EPDA arose simply because nobody recognized that it was a labor-intensive activity. We got a proportionate amount of money in comparison with Title I, and other large dollar programs, but we never had the evaluation and technical assistance to be able to run it.

Number eight--specific funding criteria authorized. There is language in the 1972 Higher Education Act which I won't read, but which essentially precludes issuance of substantial guidelines for Office of Education programs.

The question of whether that was intended really to apply to programs like Teacher Corps hasn't really been tested; we might test it this year, if we don't get that authority in legislation. And we might ask the Congress for clarification on this particular issue. The Teacher Corps didn't have clear authority to issue guidelines this year, and it was a struggle to run a sensible program.

The stipend rate would be made flexible, to correspond to other federal or local programs. Then we could bring in experienced teachers and paraprofessionals.

Finally, Senator Nelson, in introducing the legislation stressed that the Teacher Corps had been innovative and he hoped it would continue in the future to be an innovative force in American education. Congressman Quie, in introducing a very similar version of the Teacher Corps legislation, said the Teacher Corps should be used to find out what works and what doesn't work in teacher education.

That, then, is the legislation; it's summarized in your materials packet.

MR. SPRING: I'll add a few points about the legislative situation. I was on Senator Nelson's staff when the Teacher Corps legislation and various amendments were written. Since the Teachers Corps' legislative and administrative life has been somewhat checkered, it's worthwhile for a group to sit down for three or four days to think about it, and try to perceive how it looks to politicians in the Congress, especially now when things seem to be sliding gently-or maybe not so gently--downhill all over.

The program was originally proposed by Nelson and Kennedy in February 1965, when the Elementary and Secondary Education Bill (being amended right now) was just coming along. It was dropped from that bill, and has been bounced back and forth between a number of entities, among them the Higher Education and the Elementary and Secondary Education Bill.

Nelson and Kennedy were fighting over details in the legislation until July of that year. Then President Johnson--himself a teacher at one time--said at the National Education Association biennial meeting in New York, "I propose that there be a Teacher Corps."

The Teacher Corps was the last of the Great Society programs. Twenty or 30 of them flooded through Congress during the spring and summer of 1965. It passed the Senate with ease, with Johnson supporting it, but met a hell of a fight on the House floor--over the conference agreement. In fact, Teacher Corps was included in the conference agreement, because Albert Quie (who didn't like Teacher Corps at that time) carrying his Federal interests into education, allowed the Senate version to stand pat and kept the exact Senate language, thinking this the best way to get the whole Higher Education Bill defeated in the House.

It was a real cliff-hanger of a fight. The Administration was very strongly committed to the Higher Education Bill and to the Teacher Corps--at least sentimentally on the part of President Johnson; the fighting was hard and the vote won by a very close vote in the House.

That was the pattern with the House in the early years, especially the House appropriations people, always very resistant to funding a program they viewed with much suspicion.

Since that difficult dubious start in the Congress some nine years ago, what has happened? That the program started very slowly might have been a blessing in disguise, because during the last year or two there is a wonderful series of quotes from the Chairman of the Educational Subcommittee, the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, saying that the Teacher Corps had really improved and that they could do the job.

What proved to him that it could do the job? Believe me, it didn't have much to do with education. What convinced him that it had done the job was that after two years of what most people in the House (especially the House Appropriations Committee) thought of as unbelievably heavy Federal expenditures in educating people, statistics seemed to show that in fact some 60 to 70 percent of the kids who had been through the Teacher Corps stayed.

They were convinced that, in fact, the program seemed to work. Another element was that the format hammered out in setting up the Teacher Corps seemed to be well received politically. Whether it works or not educationally, you probably know better than I do; but, politically, it's made a lot of sense.

The idea was to eschew any Federal control of local education; but at the same time try to initiate change. Well, the idea was to hold out sufficient funds and the possibility of bringing some able young teachers as a way of inducing a school system or a university to plan together how to train those young teachers and how best to use them in the schools.

It was my feeling--at least when I worked with the Teacher Corps--that maybe half the programs worked quite well. Maybe 25 percent worked quite excitingly. Now, others were doing a job--well--because you were giving them the money.

But, in a number of places, it worked well--in terms of support by local education agencies for the Teacher Corps. A number of people hoped to get money, and didn't; but every program has to face that. But, overall, it seemed to generate a good deal of support.

So when in August of 1968, (I think that's the right year), the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee cut the Administrator's request for a substantially expanded Teacher Corps, we were able to organize support around the country for the full Presidential request. That involved getting telegrams of support from a large number of people--from the very conservative Commissioner of Education in California, to former Senator George Murphy--comparing Teacher Corps teachers--young kids in the Teacher Corps--favorably with those out burning flags and draft cards. Or letters to Senator Paul Fannin of Arizona arguing that the Teacher Corps was more for the American Indians than any other educational program.

With that kind of growing support in the Congress, it seemed very out of line to us that the Teacher Corps faced a declining future within the Administration. We went from a staff of 96 or so, down to about 32, at a time when a series of education commissioners (there have been quite a few) were coming to see Senator Nelson and pledging very strong support. Sid Marland said to Senator Nelson that he'd like to have $500 million for Teacher Corpos. That was just one thing.

As Russ Wood said, it's really ironic because when I came to work with Teacher Corps in 1967, the Office of Education suffered a series of cutbacks in overall staff. They cut out the Martha Sorensons--that type of program specialist in Teacher Corps. That's what you can do with numbers; to avoid really tough choices, simply apply the same numerical restrictions to everybody.

So, while the Teacher Corps grew popular, and at the same time its budget was growing, its internal staff was shrinking.

In the last few years of the Nixon Administration--for the first time in years--an Administration has turned its face away from education. And Teacher Corps and all the Office of Education have suffered.

But, fortunately, and I'm speaking politically, not educationally, (because I don't know much about education)--we have a vehicle of political value. While other education programs have suffered very markedly, the Teacher Corps has remained at the same Office of Management and Budget mark. The White House thinks the Teacher Corps worthwhile to maintain at close to $37.5 million--enough to operate on.

So, education aside, we have an established vehicle with a lot of value and flexibility. We're now in a time of gross national teacher surplus, though I never had the impression that we have too many teachers around. I'm not always sure of the quality, but it seems to me that it's a supply-and-demand situation, a question of how many teachers you're willing to pay. I don't think we have anywhere near the number of teachers we need if we're going to educate America today as it appears best.

I am taking a remedial math course, six or seven in the class, and a young medical student is teaching us. I know Russ Wood was here a couple of weeks ago explaining that class size does make a difference. We talked with the math teacher that day. He said that in terms of classes of 30 and 28, or 26 and 24, it's hard to show statistically that the smaller group does better.

But for substantial differences such as 25 and 15, or 15 and 8--there is a difference between being able to give kids of varied preparedness individual attention, not just custodial teaching. Anyway, if we have a surplus of teachers, it's certainly not of teachers trained to teach in poverty schools. That crisis continues.

Therefore, the need for successful programs bringing people into education and training them carefully to work with poverty schools, also continues. What the Teacher Corps has discovered, even in truly innovative and effective programs for the participating kids, is that the larger question goes on: Is this your main purpose for going through all that hassle? What are you doing it for? Are you doing it to improve the education available to young kids? Obviously, you can't stop with a single finding, you've got to think about what's happening to the school as a whole.

In the days when I used to go around the country, when I got tired of fighting the whole world's education, I'd cook up a trip to Tennessee or Southern California--we always wind up with good programs in Southern California. Or I'd go to Chicago--in some ways Chicago is the most. I'd go into the schools, windows broken--Teacher Corps kids would often say that we have a pretty good program, the supervising teacher who is working with us is okay, or the principal is okay, and the kids in the class are doing well.

But what happens to these kids next year when we leave? What happens next year when they move on to another class? The whole school needed to be involved in some way--if somebody knew how to bring it about. And there was always a certain amount of tension between the privileged young people in the Teacher Corps, getting a master's degree, and other young people in the school. So Russ Wood began talking to Senator Nelson several months ago about the possibility of redirecting the focus of the Teacher Corps; the possibility of expanding the concept of Teacher Corps to include not only training young teachers just coming into the schools--but also retraining teachers in the schools where the Teacher Corps team is located.

A politically attractive, very attractive idea, at a time when we have a gross teacher surplus, since it's hard to ask for expansion of a program creating even more new teachers.

How can we make change stick? The basic Teacher Corps format made a lot of sense--involving people who wanted to change in the process of planning for the change; having them set their own goals.

But it seems very plausible to me that we move beyond working with just Teacher Corps people with Teacher Corps interns, and try to do something for the whole school.

How to do it is something else again--and that's what really this conference is about. As in the original Teacher Corps format, so in these amendments; neither Senator Nelson nor Congress is about to say what the techniques ought to be. It's like the National Institute of Health: they put out money to the doctors in various fields to develop panels of experts in those fields who will decide who gets the money...

Congress has been--and will be--very leery in trying to dictate to local schools on education, or determining what changes there ought to be. There is a need for change, on that there is no doubt. So, we have been--I'm speaking as if I'm still working for Nelson sometimes--very receptive to this idea. We've worked over these amendments and we found that John Ottina, then Commissioner of Education, was also very supportive. We walked over to the other side of the Hill and talked to Albert Quie's staff. Albert Quie, as you will recall, was the man who accepted from the Senate the original Teacher Corps proposal in the Higher Education Act of 1965--hoping to use that to defeat the whole Higher Education Act.

Now, Albert Quie is saying, "Yes, I think this is a program on which we ought to go forward," or very similar language from the House side as for current legislation.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is, as always, in difficulty. First, the formula for distributing funds under Title I is extremely complex and definitely needs changing, but the hardest thing for a legislative body to do is agree on formula changes.

Some people lose, some people gain; although the method of distributing money may make sense in the large, it's always painfully arbitrary in the small. Therefore, it's extremely hard legislation to get through, especially as it's caught up in the very controversial bussing issue. It's fate is not clear.

The feeling was, in both the Senate and the House, that this was not the year to amend the Teacher Corps. We have enough trouble. Nobody's objecting to your program but why don't you amend it next year on the Higher Education Act.

We felt that the relationships between the Teacher Corps, the Office of Education, and the Bureau of the Budget were critical now. So an effort ought to be made now, because this piece of legislation has to go through. Senator Nelson made the proposal in the Senate; Quie in the House. The amendments were included in the Senate bill and passed the Senate. So they have been approved by the one.

I have not seen the language of the just completed conference report, but for those of you unfamiliar with the arcane language of the Hill, it is like all arcane languages; designed to protect the status of those who know the jargon.

The difference between a professional and somebody who is not is to know--believe me--that the words have no intrinsic profundity, they are simply just new definitions of things, so you can look at somebody who doesn't know the words and feel comfortable.

Anyway, when a bill passes the Senate and the House and goes to conference, what comes out of the conference is called a report. The language of the bill is called the report: what you think would be the report--the verbal comment--is called "remarks on the part of the managers." We probably got two changes in the report of the six or seven that we asked for: one, legislative authority to retrain teachers; and, second, the legislative authority to run demonstration projects.

But, more importantly, assuming this bill passes the House and is not vetoed, we will have a moral principle in law; in fact, Congressional recognition of the direction in which people ought to go. The Higher Education Act will have to be extended next year; I talked with Nelson's staff and we would have no difficulty in getting hearings after the new Congress comes back in January 1975, with two or three days on the Teacher Corps; on what's happened, what works, what doesn't, and where we're going. People participating in this conference should go down and talk.

I think of the March of Dimes and others who redouble their efforts having lost sight of their goal: now the challenge that Teacher Corps was established to deal with--unlike polio--has no Salk vaccine. The learning problems of poor children remain just as serious. We've taken a lot longer than we thought, but now have a tried and proven vehicle. From the political side, it is important to recognize how extremely valuable political acceptance of an institution is.

Teacher Corps has proven itself to be a strong vehicle: now we're talking about changing its direction.

(Whereupon, the above plenary session was recessed.)

DR. BUSH: The Teacher Corps now has the mandate to be the rallying point for whatever happens in education personnel development. The necessity for community, local school systems and higher education constituting a group, is now pretty well established.

How we're going to make this group work effectively, will be vital for the next decade.

We're going to pretend the Congress has given us new legislation and $35 million.

Now, it is implied that in the past five years the Corps has aimed toward implementing competency-based teacher education--CBTE. Should it, in the period ahead, continue with a single model, or seek a diverse approach?

In terms of alternatives of teacher development and resource allocation--do we want or do we not want to have alternatives?

DR. JOYCE: Yes. On that particular issue should the alternatives be considered competency-based education? I see that as a spurious issue, that is, whether we train people to be competent or not. Teacher education should continue to push for competency-based teacher education--not supporting everything any State might try to test--but trying to define competence and trained worth, whatever the persuasion, open education or something else.

DR. GARTNER: One of the troubles I have with your alternatives is that they are not of the same order.

One set talks about kids who will be served by teachers trained in the Corps. Are those black, Chicano, Puerto Rican or native American--or prisoners, or "not kids" for that matter, or are they kids with so-called handicaps? That's all part of the same package of what kind of kids you deal with.

Then you have another alternative: open education.

Then you have CBTE and its antonym: the incompetent teacher, our model for so long. With respect to history, we're probably going to continue it...

Part of it has to do with the rightness of single priority. If I don't win on a unilateral approach, then I go for a "different strokes" approach.

Now, what kind of approach is helpful to OE? Ninety percent of activity falls into one program area--educational improvement for the disadvantaged.

DR. PANKRATZ: I think the issue that you were aluding to before was that during the sixth, seventh and eighth cycles, at least in six and seven, there had to be a CBTE component specified in certain ways. There was a guideline model. If you want to buy into Teacher Corps, you buy into that. But the issue now is whether we continue with guidelines that spell out what that model should be. With Dick Graham that was the way it was--at least in the sixth cycle. Do we look for alternative models within more general guidelines?

DR. GARTNER: I guess the question that I have relates to the characteristics of a model, the characteristics of the kids served, or the characteristics of structures supported by the schools, or the characteristics of hobgoblin stuff like CBTE. What is the cut of a "characteristic?" That's what I'm not clear about.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: Another way of looking at the 90 percent is in terms of the proportion of children not doing well in school, rather than on the basis of poverty. Cut your ten percent the same way; there are many children, middle class, upper class, of parents of all ethnic groups and races who aren't doing well either. Instead of thinking of it in terms of poverty, think of it in terms of effectiveness of the school.

DR. BUSH: If we did that would we be departing from the mandate of the Congress.

Can you give us a little interpretation as to why they opened the crack ten percent?

DR. GARTNER: It was thought it might be useful if you had a particular training or retraining technique you were experimenting with.

If you ran a suburban school where the number of poor kids was nominal but where the education was somewhat different, it might be useful.

DR. BUSH: Did Congress ever know that a lot of the problems of 90 percent occurred in more affluent suburbs? Part of the vicious cycle in a low income area is the result of attitudes and understandings in other parts of our society.

MR. MORRISON: You mean the people are held in poverty because of the prejudice against them?

DR. BUSH: Yes, and I was wondering if that was part of the reasoning that went into the 10-percent aspect of the program.

DR. JOYCE: I would say no. The idea that Teacher Corps is going to be changing the attitudes of the wealthy is probably not generally held.

DR. BUSH: But we're going to work on that in the next five years if we intend to follow the mandate of the Congress.

DR. OLSON: We might begin with the notion that we not only have legislation, but that Teacher Corps is an instrument of the national policy in the schools.

The courts and federal policy do indicate the direction education policy should take.

One of these is that the schools of the nation ought to be integrated. That is Federal policy. Yet, over 70 percent of school administrators in training in this country don't believe in integration.

The courts have indicated that students have certain due process rights in the schools. Yes, a very high percentage of the teachers in training believe we hear "far too much on minority rights and not a sufficient amount about majority rights."

A number of court cases, the Yoder case for one, defines the rights of parents and of their culture not to be disrupted by the continuing process of the schools. And this implies certain skills on the parts of education personnel. We don't attend to these decisions.

But the most significant decisions imply certain criteria must be applied in the development of licensing: Griggs, Chance, Nansemond, etc.

I would like to argue very strongly that the Teacher Corps be considered an instrument of court-mandated Federal policy, with respect to the education of the young in this country. We have no right to participate in the development of recruitment and training whose main attitudes are contrary to announced Federal policy.

DR. BUSH: Is the corollary that highest priority is bringing educational personnel views into line with nationally announced policy?

DR. OLSON: I think that's the base line from which we start.

DR. BUSH: What's been Teacher Corps' stance in the past with regard to that? Would this represent a significant change over the past?

DR. OLSON: I don't know what the stance is. It is very hard to separate out "announced policy" from the statistical documentation concerning the present teaching force being trained with respect to the issues I have laid out. We have no "punch line" value statements on the basis of which Teacher Corps policy on recruitment was set.

Court decisions are most important. They ought to give rise to criteria according to which a Federal agency--including Teacher Corps--would operate. It's basic. We've got to start there.

DR. BUSH: Would you think law has more application for selection or for training?

DR. OLSON: Both. And legislation I see coming will have a great deal of education for retraining and recertification of people.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: Dr. Olson, I can feel a great deal of sympathy with the view you are expressing; the courts and the Congress are moving into directions that we approve.

Now, if the time came when legislation specified important decisions about the military training of people in the schools, would your position be the same?

DR. OLSON: First, I don't think I'd be at this conference if that were the case. Secondly, I am sufficiently familiar with civil disobedience to know what the tools are.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: I'm asking whether it is wise to lay down the proposition that we build education upon whatever the Congress and the courts lay down, or whether we build on a moral basis superior to other possible judgments.

It is, in my judgment, dangerous to say we are going to base education policy on court decisions, and that the Congress will be a determining factor.

I'm in favor of what we're trying to do. I'm not in favor of justifying it on the basis of court decisions.

DR. BUSH: Would this represent a change from what we've been doing the last five or ten years?

DR. OLSON: First, we ought to try to obey the law and "announced national policy" with respect to the kinds of teachers our children need.

DR. CORRIGAN: We have some laws now which, based on our value system and teacher education, and types of schools we want, we ought to be changing. We ought to be training teachers to press for changes. A quarter of the states in this country still have corporal punishment statutes on the books. That's a law which we ought to be doing something about.

Let's look at our competency-based teacher education programs (if that's what we've been doing for the last five years) and let's see whether we have any of the kinds of contents or skills needed in bringing about changes in the areas Paul is talking about. We tend to focus on reading, writing and mathematics more than we do on professional and political questions.

DR. BUSH: I see several signals of agreement.

MS. DELANO: The document we have given on open education dealt with these relationships.

It's something that's very pertinent right now, because it raises the point that these very minimal segmentalized departmentalized skills were the only ones mentioned, because they were the only ones that people thought they could get. I hope that Teacher Corps aims can become much broader at this moment in history.

DR. GARTNER: Part of the problem is thinking you can test political-social effectiveness, but part also is the myth (I trust none of us believe it), that teachers are supposed to be neutral; neutral between equal rights and no rights. With Civil Rights groups on one hand, and the Klan on the other, teachers are still supposed to take the middle road.

Perhaps it's between some rights or no rights for kids; obviously, one couldn't be too serious about a lot of rights for kids. No Federal program has been willing to assert openly and seriously a posture on all social, economic and political issues.

I share concern as to whether we go with what this Congress and this set of courts suggest is the law. In a different time, we might want to go with the President's expression of the national standards rather than that of Congress or the courts.

The question is whether a program such as Teacher Corps is ready and able to take that kind of a posture on political, social, and economic questions.

That's a quite different cut from saying we will aim only at low income kids or handicapped kids.

Maybe that's all a Federal program can do, but I think Paul has done us a service by forcing us to consider one option.

DR. PANKRATZ: CBTE or not CBTE is really not an issue: the issue is the taking of a stance, based upon our values. CBTE can be used very conservatively, but that's not really critical. What is critical is taking a valuing stance in political terms and then applying competency based on that. It's the valuing stance that we're looking for.

DR. BUSH: Does your statement mean that it's a high priority item to develop teacher educational personnel willing and able to take effective valuing stances?

DR. PANKRATZ: I think so. We've been too long with technical skills, which can be used for good or for ill. We need a higher priority on taking a valuing stance and directing our attention to that.

DR. BARRY: Whether or not we decide to take a valuing stance at the Federal level, in actuality any time teachers teach kids (and not only in Teacher Corps programs or other programs) judgments are made about those kids, and how we're teaching them. The question that Dr. Olson so thoughtfully presented is actually at work every day, every minute, in the schools in which you are working.

I have seen recurrent themes in CBTE that deal with the attitudes of teachers toward the children we are serving in Teacher Corps programs--attitudes relating to the less socially secure and economically affluent. In the materials developed to date on the exceptional child, we are attempting to train regular teachers to deal with handicapped children.

We return, repeatedly, to the theme that in breaking the isolation of those handicapped children, in giving individualized instructions in flexible groupings, and in teacher teaming, we are attempting the kinds of things that was also implicit in some Administration thinking.

Whether or not we deal with this on a national level is a matter of policy. Incidentally, it is happening all the time in our classroom; the Teacher Corps staff makes value judgments implicit in all that we're doing.

MS. GERALD: But I don't know whether in a Federal agency we could do other than uphold the law as it stands.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: On the question of equality, the question of the intergrated schools or any value questions that have been raised, our position ought to be drawn from the moral ideology of this nation, in which the courts find the basis of their own judgment. There is a democratic ideology--the basis of the notion of equality. I welcome the court decisions in support of the schools, and our efforts to protect teachers who have the same views that we have. I don't draw my basis for saying so from the decisions of the courts and the acts of the Congress, but from the moral principles of this country. I welcome their support but that's as far as I will go.

MR. WALKER: Dr. Olson, are you saying that we should be doing something to strengthen the moral fiber of this country?

DR. OLSON: I believe that I was just proposing a way of making policy in a program directed to teacher education.

I am saying, based upon the data I have been able to gather formally and informally, that we have a pool of teachers a large percentage of whom do not believe in the fundamental policy of the country as announced by the courts. We have to ask ourselves whether we are concerned about that. And I'm trying to talk about a way in which you construct policy.

We have put several hundred million dollars into teacher education in the last decade; we have Carnegie study data and other data from a national pool of teachers, most of whom must have been out of preservice training less than a year or so. I don't think they are in a position to carry out what this country has said it wants for its children, and its schools.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: What are the attitudes on this same question of people training teachers?

DR. OLSON: Almost identical.

MS. MAHONEY: Paul, does this mean that there are some people rated as acceptable, and that we do know how to identify those that are effective or would be the kind of people that are needed? If we know that, then does that mean to Teacher Corps that this is an umbrella and that's what Teacher Corps ought to do.

DR. GARTNER: We slipped in the word "effective." Dr. Olson is talking about attitude. Do we have any evidence that suggests that if I think that Lau is right, or Tinker is right, or Griggs was right, that I could help a black or white or Chicano or handicapped kid learn better?

DR. BUSH: Do we have material in these data about administrators and teachers being out of phase with national policy?

DR. OLSON: There's a lot of it. But the point I want to make is not whether the data is right or wrong, but whether we began with a notion that we respect: that legal mandates affect teachers, and that there are certain large long-term policy directions that this country seems to have set for itself.

DR. JOYCE: It's very clear that this type of finding suggesting that teachers are not as interested in social justice as they might be has for at least 50 years characterized, right up to the present, the bulk of teachers. And yet we have never developed systematic means of training teachers to look at the issues--in terms of student rights and cultural rights and their legal and operational implications in terms of equal society and that kind of thing. There's almost no training material and no training procedures. So, the schools plan in a legal and moral vacuum with respect to many issues.

Will resources be systematically put into this area; will Teacher Corps act not only symbolically, but in its program? There are vast implications in this; they should be brought up at the right time.

DR. BUSH: So, we have probably shied away from this valuing in teacher and administrator training. We ought to give it some more attention.

The priority issue, as set forth in this statement, isn't all together adequate.

Dr. Smith, as regards the agenda, the issue between competency-based education and open education is not really genuine? If it is a genuine issue, does competency-based teacher education pay enough attention to value questions? We want to hear from you, Dr. Smith.

DR. BILL SMITH: Russ Wood pointed out that our real intent is to try to take advantage of your talents to help us put together what Teacher Corps is and can be about.

Russ had intended to put together some basic operational notions for you because we want a product from you to help us to go forward. We are not concerned about whether open education ever gets into, or CBTE ever stays in the Teacher Corps. Our concern is what problems in American education can be addressed today--with Teacher Corps legislative authority--what can Teacher Corps do best?

So, I would hope you don't get into whether CBTE or open education are critical issues, but rather discuss all the issues and then devise strategies for dealing with problems within the constraints of the legislation--or even beyond the constraints of the legislation, so that we might propose to Congress changes to make us more effective.

I'm sure you know from the experience of the last five years that the major issue is the relationship between training provided from our resources and the behavior of the teacher and of the child. We aren't sure we are in a position to answer the question: we have attempted to find the means to come up with an answer. We need answers for our response to the Congress, to society, and to the profession. The questions need to be answered, but we aren't sure whether they are value issues within the control of the legislation, or Teacher Corps, or whether they are value issues that need to be raised, but not addressed by us because we have no means of addressing them.

I have no problems with the notion that the school cannot or is unable to change that which it has legal responsibility and educational leadership to change. Is the school in a position even to influence the significant "others" who must participate in the process of major social change. We must consider what we're able to do with whatever resources we can contribute, (1) to the changes in education that we can control, (2) to influence the significant "others" to understand the problems that must be dealt with in major social change.

Perhaps we are discussing a very small segment rather than the problem. We pragmatically deal with the kinds of problems faced in American education that can be dealt with first from a teacher education perspective--because that's our authority.

Secondly, we should look at things beyond that in order to influence significant "others" who can make policy go beyond the impact of teacher education.

If we have a sense of the real world and can use it in the Teacher Corps, in the Office of Education, or share it with the significant "others", it would be quite important.

The last nine years of Teacher Corps has shown us a number of things: a great need for highly competent teachers to serve children from the low income, urban and rural areas; success in recruiting and training young people to teach in low income schools; what's going on in communities with many low income kids; and we know also that there are many kids today not in low income schools who have been tuned out, or turned off from what the schools, and, in some instances, the society provide.

OE addresses the broad issue of American education; Teacher Corps, the issue of children in poverty, and educational personnel trained to serve them. We're asking whether what we attempt to get institutions of higher education and local education agencies to do in low income areas is related in any way to what ought to be done in all of the schools across the nation.

Since 1965, more innovation has taken place in low income schools, and we are trying to assess relationships between the amount of training given, the impact of that training on the behavior of teachers, and the impact of the behavioral changes on the performance of kids in which the school is really the smallest unit of change.

And if you expect to effect lasting change, everybody in that school must be involved in the process. You can't talk about individual change, or individual teacher change; you've got to talk about it in an organizational context.

How do you measure it? Historically, we had one-to-one relationships between the teacher and her class, but we may not have taken into account all the factors necessary in measuring impacts on that relationship.

We are particularly interested in pursuing whether or not a strategy has been developed to effect better measurements, especially since we have the possibility of new legislation that would allow that.

Second, how do we, with our limited resources, prioritize the thrust that we should be exploring in light of the responsibilities that the National Institute of Education has for primary research in developmental activities? How do we tie these pieces together so that they are beneficial not only to the researcher and the teacher but also to the schools? These are the kind of questions that I am particularly interested in.

DR. GARTNER: Have you recruited committed young people and then not harmed them too much in the training program, so they turn out pretty well? We know that in medical school, education and legal education, people lose commitments to service over the course of training. Concern with social issues, with service to the patient or client diminishes during law school and medical school.

The functional instrument catalyzing socialization in the profession is making money and doing good for yourself, not an effective instrument in terms of social equity. Schools of education have not had much effect on people's values in that way not because they haven't cared in the same way that medical schools have cared, but because they are ineffectual.

And how about recruitment? What's the relative balance between recruitment, the consequence of recruitment, and the consequence of the effect of the training and preparation?

DR. BILL SMITH: Within the Teacher Corps context it seems to me that Corwin clearly points out that many of the early interns lost the commitment that they had because they had come with missionary zeal to the problem of inner city education or a rural poverty education.

The data suggests that people who come from the locality being served maintain their commitment longer and tend to be as, if not more, successful than those who come with a missionary zeal from the outside.

In a historical context, we have learned from the Teacher Corps and EPDA experience to look at other-than-the-new people we bring into a school if we expect to maintain the commitment to education of the kids in that school.

The notion of trying to bring in all the people who are going to remain there, along with the new people, becomes important.

We don't yet know enough about the background characteristics of interns in the Teacher Corps program. Dave Marsh's study points out that there's very little relationship between background characteristics of interns and other factors they look at. I'm not sure that the question of recruitment in Teacher Corps, and the selection and recruitment of people at the local level who have an interest in the community being served, is as much an issue now as before.

DR. GARTNER: I agree completely: It would be naive at best to suggest that the youngest and weakest person in institutions (as the new teachers are) could be the vehicle for serious change in that institution. That Teacher Corps wants to deal with all the people involved, if not the whole district, makes very good sense.

I don't buy Bill Spring's gross national teacher surplus. As for its consequences on equity issues, I'll reference a document I wrote--a study of the Alaska combined COP and Teacher Corps program.

It's clear that in Alaska if you don't target recruitment very specifically you end up perpetuating what has been true in Alaska all along: that native children are taught by freebooters. Three years ago, the Teacher Corps graduated seven native Alaskans, more than doubling the number of native teachers in the State. When 23 people graduated this spring, that tripled the total. The University of Alaska, in the last 15 years, has graduated only one native teacher while the COP-Teacher Corps program has graduated nearly 30.

DR. BILL SMITH: I would assume that the notion of local recruitment tends to reinforce the inclusion of the native better than before, and I don't see that as being something that's going to go away in the Teacher Corps program. But the questions of how many interns will be included in the Teacher Corps program is another question.

I would hope Teacher Corps becomes a vehicle that demonstrates training strategy techniques that can be picked up by an institution desirous of adopting new strategy.

If we were to carry the notion of Alaskan natives to its final conclusion, the Teacher Corps provides the vehicle and institution for the inclusion of the native, and I'm not sure (aside from it being so because it's part of the design), that I see it as being any more important than that.

I should be talking about it in terms of what teacher education can provide that could be used by everyone in teacher education, without the Teacher Corps being responsible for it happening all over the nation.

DR. OLSON: Many legislatures are mandating 20 or 30 percent reductions in teacher education; others are encouraging 50 percent reductions but not mandating them, through encouraging counseling out of inappropriate people.

This can become a matter of litigation. Certainly it's an obligation of an institution to use the best possible judgment with respect to what the public wants and what the courts seem to demand in the selection of teacher candidates.

Now, if the Teacher Corps can develop needs assessments reflecting the needs of the local communities, and identify how these needs can be filled in terms of job descriptions, recruitment could be specifically targeted in terms of the needs. If Teacher Corps developed such an instrumentation, it could have an enormous effect on American teacher education. And I think somebody is going to have to do it.

Teacher Corps can't expect to do everything so if it does this one thing well (simply by virtue of providing a flexible model), I think in the next five years with the so-called teacher surplus, we have an opportunity to construct priorities to develop quality--in terms other than simply grading on a transcript, currently the primary criterion for admitting students to teacher education programs. And that isn't working very well.

DR. BILL SMITH: Let me take it one level lower because it seems to me that in light of the Lau decision and the right-to-education decision, things are happening nationally (even though the State legislatures are cutting back on teacher education) we have an opportunity to be involved.

The conference committee in HR 69 has included in bilingual education a percentage of the monies for teacher training.

The Congress has provided for a percentage of the monies to be used in Title I, and the Congress has added more money to the Educational Professions Development Act than the Administration asked for.

In addition to that, there are funds in the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. The National Institute of Education is funding experimentation of development activities in certain areas of teacher education.

This group, in light of all of that, might want to confine itself to the Teacher Corps and the Teacher Corps legislation about teacher training problems and problems in American education that can be affected by teacher training; to the kinds of strategy that could be employed, using for the first time direct service resources to do things that teacher training authorities don't usually allow.

We've put ourselves in a box by talking about Teacher Corps and issues Teacher Corps is interested in, rather than talking about the problems in American education that personnel development can alleviate, whether it's via Teacher Corps legislation or any other kind of legislation. We should seize a problem and say, "Here's something Teacher Corps--with legislative authority--can do; here's something Teacher Corps--with extended legislation--can do." But at the same time, we have a package that the Office of Education and the American community can use.

DR. BUSH: We discussed that a little earlier. Instead of getting too bogged down in Teacher Corps at the outset, we ought to be looking more generally at the needs in teacher education, and then translate how the new legislation would make that possible. For example, if open education as a concept philosophically fits something then what needs to be done structurally, what needs to be done in terms of staff, in order for it to be implemented needs to be considered--even before you get to the issue of training.

If we are talking about resources that are going to be available to us, or to be dispensed by the Federal government without constraint that teacher personnel development legislation has, then it ought to be dealt with.

We ought to be talking about all the dimensions open that education requires. The implications for teacher training could be piggybacked on to whatever Teacher Corps is doing, but you have a much broader base to work from if you don't restrict yourselves.

I'm very concerned about existing schools, about the baby boom from the fifties through the seventies, and the range and effectiveness of teachers during that period. Also, we must consider the number of teachers who will be in the pipeline for the next ten to twenty years as a result of the baby boom.

It relates to Dr. Olson's comment about the number of teachers who, in the past 10 or 20 years, may have been ill-trained to deal with problems faced in the schools today, without even talking about the preparation necessary for the teacher of the year 2000.

DR. CORRIGAN: Yes, there's a specific need for retraining all teachers, starting with the necessity to link preservice programs and programs for experienced teachers. We just don't have the general fund money for training a million and half teachers. That's a vital factor in any new legislation. Resources must be provided to achieve this goal.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: You can think in terms of the large programs that the Teacher Corps might attract. Such as determining the conditions under which teachers can exercise their competence.

And if Teacher Corps utilizes demonstration schools of some sort, it will need to consider how to increase the conditions that make it possible for well-trained teachers to utilize their competence.

Let me illustrate. There is often conflict in the school between the administrative authority and the authority of the teacher's competence. And that has to be resolved. You've got to have a system in which that conflict, as it arises, has to be settled: competence and the teachers' welfare are at stake.

Secondly, the poverty of the classroom, in most cases, exceeds that of the students. No carpenter or plumber could operate effectively with the scarcity of equipment and poor quality of equipment that the teachers face in the classroom.

Furthermore, a competent teacher is not permitted to select his own tools. By that fact, he may be rendered incompetent. You do not tell a carpenter what tools he's going to use, and you don't select them for him.

We need to test how we can take the individual school and shape it so that the competence of principal and teachers is fully utilized.

Think in terms of school-based management with the budget under the control of the teachers and where the teacher has a classroom budget, to spend as he thinks best. I can't go into everything, but this needs to be attacked and improved in American education.

Now, the selection and recruitment of teachers needs to be considered. Dr. Bill Smith has emphasized the need for training. Basically, we do not, at present, have adequate plans for the training and preparation of teachers.

We've a lot of parts; we need to put some of these parts together in different ways. It's said that people who come from Teacher Corps have problems with classroom management, they don't get along with pupils, and have the same problems that teachers trained in older ways have.

They are unable to help pupils, they express the need of more "know how" to work with pupils. The experience they've had was good, but they find that they need more.

Seminars didn't always make a big difference with respect to getting hold of knowledge and making use of it. Many products of the Teacher Corps did not teach in schools for which they were specially prepared. Though that is not a waste of talent, nevertheless, we didn't give them the job we were training them to do. Often, too, they were resited by teachers already established in the system.

We have to create conditions for the utilization of competence if we expect teachers to be successful.

These things came out of studies we paid for and we ought to take them seriously and say, "How can we remedy the defects those studies point out?"

They talked of the relation of the school to the community, of the relationship between trained school personnel, and parents and others in the community.

It's just as important as teacher preparation in other domains, and these are things the Teacher Corps has to face if it's going to make a dent.

Now, a basic matter is teacher attitudes and how you change attitudes. I believe that changing the objective conditions in which a person works, making him face the realities of the situation, will aid attitudinal changes.

I'm not saying that pre-existing attitudes are not important, but changing the objective circumstances is extremely important.

DR. BUSH: Dr. Bunnie Smith's statements are very persuasive, particularly those on changing conditions, so teacher competence can be given an opportunity to be used.

You've all seen situations where that's taking place, or where conditions have really been changed, and there is a structure and materials can be brought in, and win control over budget, and so forth. It would be helpful if you give us some clues as to how we work at it.

MR. MORRISON: You really highlighted the outstanding problems in teacher education. First, the teacher-administration conflict. Perhaps we need more focus on retraining the administrators: teachers are retrained when they leave the college and come into the schools. They don't know it, but they are retrained to work in a way different to that which they had been taught and believed in.

The poverty of the classroom may well connect to lack of teacher economy or school economy; schools don't have budgets and teachers generally don't have budgets either, or at least they lack control over the use of the budget. And in many cases, there is a lack of relevant community involvement, and that goes against sound educational principles.

We have to start where the child is, and the child, the school environment, the place where he lives, and so on.

In many cases, there is a lack of on-the-job training, whether internal or external to the school. But while these problems exist, there are programs now in practice heeding these needs to some extent.

Take New York City and the impression people have carried over the years; New York City is just a worthless system; don't bother with it, just turn it over.

But tremendous changes are already taking place in many schools within that city. Reorganization programs have really turned things around; our school is meeting many needs and has changed many things through joint planning and participation of teachers, parents, students and administration.

We're given a budget allocation now. Traditionally, the administration ordered stuff--often not relevant, or not used.

We institutionalized personal budgets and it has been policy for the past three years; teachers get allocations and other materials. We support this by providing them with catalogues and providing the experience. Teachers use the stuff and purchase it together, and so on.

We've taken a large school, decentralized it into smaller units with the philosophy of "openness" because teachers asked to work together in classes organized on the basis of what we know about children. We have a wide range of ages and a whole mix of children. Teachers have asked to work together and, wherever possible, we put them together. We said, "You have the budget; schedule classes and teach the way you like--you're not locked into a principal's office."

By releasing teachers we have formed clusters of teachers who help prepare the classroom teachers. It's crucial to bring people together if we want to work together to give them budgetary authority and scheduling authority to make use of teacher centers like the open education center which provides us with advisers. We must make them available by making workshops available in the schools attended by parents, teachers, or whoever wants to come.

MR. ENOS: I like the attack on conditions. Good conditions must exist if teachers are to exhibit competence. We haven't allowed teachers to experiment very much, or to fail--which is a necessary experience.

And a great deal of training can be done when the atmosphere allows people to free up.

DR. BUSH: We might consider ways in which workable conditions can be nurtured; that's a high priority item. And we must get the right people; we will be able to select some good people. Teacher Corps has more people wanting to go in than you can take; not a phenomenon normally true in teacher education over the past 25 or 50 years.

We took anybody for as long as he wanted to stay, and then let him teach wherever he wanted to. But now we can select. We're currently wasting a tremendous amount of teacher talent. It is there, it's a resource we are not now using but could unlock in new moves forward.

We can get new teachers into schools that innovate then arrange a system that helps them move on into the system and continue to develop. That's a terribly important key step.

DR. BARRY: Just a comment--Sid Morrison wouldn't be in that school but for the effort of parents who fought to gain control of the school, something left out in this discussion. It goes back to Dr. Olson's issue of values, what we want out of them, and training.

DR. CORRIGAN: I thought you were implying that we ought to place prospective teachers only in innovative schools. I suggest that we take a school in the boondocks, the worst school, one that really needs help, existing at that time. The goal could be to help the school reform itself through new approaches to training. Training would be a by-product of the larger end in view, improving the learning environment of children and youth.

DR. BUSH: But you're talking about a whole school.

DR. CORRIGAN: In fact, I would like to go beyond schools, into the total community--the educational delivery system that exists in human service agencies in the community. We need to link colleges with other education resources for teaching and learning for lifelong education.

MR. SNEDCOF: It would be helpful to get some clear statement of your relationship for certain givens. What's puzzling to me is the relationship between competence, and conditions, with a quick tie-in to parents and values. Does this state the basic problems?

MR. WALKER: At the local level, I hear the school people say that educators and our interns don't pay any attention to what they are doing in the schools. They assume they are doing nothing and everything they have been doing is bad.

Sometimes I think we say that, and I hear them saying, "All we ask you to do is just take a look." Sometimes we don't look at what they do, and some of us here bear new testimony to the fact that somebody was doing something well--or we wouldn't be here.

And I think that we should--in all of this--tell interns that they should take a look at what's there first, before they start talking about changes.

DR. BUSH: That certainly is an important lesson.

(Whereupon, the above plenary session was recessed.)

DR. BUSH: First, two introductions.

DR. GITTELL: This is Victor Alicea, President of a Puerto Rican community-based college recently organized in Washington, New York, and New Jersey, which is doing teacher training.

DR. BILL SMITH: This is Roz Menzel, contractor for the OECD Paris Conference, to be held in November, on national teaching policies. She has been contracted by OE to put together documents required by OECD.

We invited her to join us so that if any of our information is beneficial to the international world we'll have it on tape.

DR. BUSH: We roamed over a lot of territory in our last discussions--all the way from talking about whether or not we had posed the issues correctly; whether or not we should concentrate on developing teachers and administrators who would obey the law; whether we would work more on value orientation, and whether or not we would concentrate on some of the things that the Teacher Corps has been doing and could do; or on the larger issues of what needs doing in education, generally, and in teacher education, particularly.

And Dr. Bill Smith pulled out some concerns that might be focused more on Teacher Corps issues and problems alone.

What we learn in working in low income communities ought to apply to other parts of our society where people are having learning difficulties.

There was an interesting question as to how we relate what we're doing in teaching and teacher education in the Office of Education with what is done with the National Institute of Education and its work in those areas. Perhaps we can deal with it later.

We concluded that there are some very important problems in recruitment and selection to which the changed supply-and-demand situation brings new possibilities.

There are problems in how we are going to cope with the fact that in the past teachers have been told what to do. Now, with their more powerful organization, they're going to want to have some decision in what is done in the organization and conduct of schools.

And just as we began to adjourn, Bunnie Smith came in with what I think was a brilliant summarization of the fact that we need to be concerned with the conditions in schools that will enable the competence that is there, particularly on the part of the teachers, to be used in the most constructive way.

That's not an adequate summary, but at least it hits some of the high points that we were dealing with.

Now, I think that in the period ahead, we do not want to take tightly unified approaches to problems even if we did in the past. And certainly we have issues to be dealt with in the next phase.

Unless I hear strong contradiction, I will assume that that is the consensus of the group--that we should be proceeding on a variety of problems in the next step forward.

What precisely the topics will be is still open. We've had some good candidates--some that haven't even been considered. For example, we need more debate on the very important area of special education for handicapped children. There's been a plea made for it but really not much discussion. And the same for a number of others.

Now, given the fact that we want to have some different approaches, how do you go about designing the approach to different facets of the program? Should we give our attention particularly to what works and what doesn't work?--that's a serious question.

This was one of the challenges that was given to us in the urban-rural program. Some advisors suggested that that is probably a question we couldn't answer at this point in time.

They said, it's best to say what a given group of people are willing to share with others as having given them the satisfaction of accomplishment, rather than saying in unequivocal terms, what doesn't and what does work.

Now, those are quite different questions; easier to answer than the other. Whether we're ready to tackle what works and what doesn't is, I think, a question we ought to consider.

When the Corps, given all our recommendations, develops requests for proposals, should the intention in the formal notification of the Teacher Corps project be very specific or not so specific?

That is a very important question in light of the past history of Teacher Corps: how wide a latitude--when we move into the next format--should we have in relationship to our thinking in the past.

So, I would suggest that we try to climb back on the lofty pedestal of general problems that we left and after we meet some response on that, then perhaps we can say, "These are the major problems. How have we done in the past, how can we do better in the future?"

MR. MORRISON: On what works and what doesn't work in getting back to the problems; we began to touch also on the role of the principal at the building level where the result is a conflict between the teacher and the administration.

The relationship between the University and the school--in some cases, there is a very good working relationship--and the role of the community in effecting some changes seem to be areas we ought to explore further.

DR. BUSH: Thank you very much. I did not mention administration or community involvement. Both are important additions to the summary.

DR. GITTELL: To go back to the value section, I don't think we can deal with projects or even talk about them unless we agree on some of these basic value goals.

And one I'm willing to throw in for discussion would influence almost everything to do with Teacher Corps. That is, whether or not we're really interested in training teachers who are client-oriented rather than self-interested or professionally-oriented. And if you say yes to that, then you've agreed to a whole slew of things.

It seems to me that this is an absolutely essential issue. I'm sure other people can come up with other such values, but I would hate to go ahead without dealing with very specific things such as this issue, so we can mentally program the priorities and structure the training to that kind of value.

DR. BUSH: Could you define those two terms--"professionally-oriented" and "client-oriented?"

DR. GITTELL: Well, there have been studies in teacher education institutions which show that students in the first year of teacher training already have been socialized, by the end of the first year, to the degree that teachers 10 or 15 years in the field are socialized, and that never changes.

Some of the attitudinal results are defined in the Carnegie studies. These indicate the kinds of attitudes already alluded to. It seems to me that though many of those attitudes come from socialization processes prior to the teacher training institution, the teacher training institution enhances this kind of approach or attitudinal development and doesn't detract from it at all, and it's not doing the job that I would want it to do.

Dr. Alan Gartner said that by the end of the training period, in the medical and legal profession, the individual is more oriented towards earning a living, having a good life for himself, and less client-interested, less people-oriented.

I'm sure the same thing is true of most of the institutions that do teacher training. When we discussed the Professional Development Act in the Wingspread Conference, one of the things we insisted be included in the guidelines was that programs were to be developed with community groups--because we wanted a client orientation.

Our commitment was to having the clients provide input--in this case, parents and children or even in some cases, students--as to what they wanted out of a learning situation. That's the situation I would make.

DR. CORRIGAN: Let me suggest that the Teacher Corps might find itself supporting the training institution as a child advocate, which, in some respects, would put it in conflict with teachers' associations and unions, primarily set up now to protect the rights of teachers, not those of children.

DR. GARTNER: Excuse me, Dr. Corrigan. What's the evidence that the training institution manages to play the role of child advocate?

DR. CORRIGAN: All personnel in a college, or school of education or State education department supposedly are getting paid to serve the public whether they are doing research or training. Whatever they are doing, it is supposed to improve the learning environment of children. That's what State money is supposed to be used for.

DR. GARTNER: Is that what the public gives money for?

DR. CORRIGAN: No, not all teachers appear to understand why they get paid. Teacher associations are organized primarily to protect teachers' rights.

In fact, if you ask representatives of the teacher organizations, as I did recently, why they defended a teacher in this particular situation and what their view was about the rights of the children, the answer is that someone else is taking care of the rights of the children--and the job of teacher organizations is to support the rights of the teachers, not the rights of the children.

DR. GARTNER: But the slogan goes, "Teachers want what children need..."

DR. CORRIGAN: Well, I don't think everything that teacher groups have supported is right for kids. What I'm asking is whether we want the Teacher Corps to become a child advocate--not alone, but with many other child advocacy groups.

DR. GILLIN: In the ideal world, that would be true.

DR. CORRIGAN: We're talking about now what should be. What we should concentrate on is ends.

DR. GILLIN: Do we have to say either/or? It's the dichotomy that bothers me.

DR. CORRIGAN: Well, eliminate whatever dichotomy I made.

DR. GILLIN: I was dealing with the real world.

DR. CORRIGAN: What's the end view in training?

DR. GILLIN: I'm not sure that's any more real than the fact that people operate from "day-to-day" and "moment-to-moment" at many levels.

I don't think that all teachers are bucking for a raise in salary and rejecting or identifying with kids to the exclusion of a real concern for themselves.

DR. CORRIGAN: We're talking about political, social systems. We're not talking about individual teachers. We're talking about an organization.

DR. GILLIN: We're talking about the real world.

DR. CORRIGAN: The real world is that the Teacher Corps is a political power base from which you can make a difference in the lives of kids.

DR. GARTNER: I'm going to ask another definition then. What is child advocacy?

DR. CORRIGAN: The rights of children. If children are getting beaten, you protect them. And you train teachers to be child-oriented that way. You may have to train them, in fact, to reject some of the notions of their professional organization. And you'll find yourself in conflict when you do that.

But what you do is raise people's level of sensitivity to that. Professional preparation is not just membership, its an organization.

DR. GARTNER: But to talk about rights of children--protecting them against being beaten is easy; harder to deal with is abuse of a child by a teacher who perceives that child to be incapable of learning. That is the kind of child abuse that goes on in the schools.

I don't deny that there's some beating, but what really hurts is the teacher who says in every possible way (except with a straight sentence, and I wouldn't mind so much if it were with a straight sentence), "Hey, kid, you're no good."

DR. CORRIGAN: Exactly. Let's take another spin-off before we talk about it. The special education area is moving into the mainstream of education.

Special education has been maintained by legislation to meet the needs of special learning disabilities and handicaps. And that's where Teacher Corps comes in--to protect the rights of those children, not only in terms of special education people but in terms of counselors, school administrators. With the new legislation, we're not just dealing with teachers anymore.

That's another linkage we ought to talk about here. Teacher Corps is the only group in the Federal Government right now that's going to be dealing with the whole question of how to mainstream other people, including those other than special education people. We're talking about all children and about all education personnel now.

We're taking a specific value question of how to help every human being live with people who differ and provide them equal access to learning opportunities in least restrictive environments.

DR. STEFFENSON: You say "all education personnel." We may save some time if we clear that up now.

DR. BUSH: I understand the charter to mean that parents, paraprofessionals, counselors, administrators, speech therapists, social studies teachers, everybody who has relevance to the educational program, is included.

DR. GARTNER: Well, the parent is going beyond our mandate here, but it's not beyond what Dr. Smith said in asking us to look at the whole issue, so that the Teacher Corps will do what it can.

DR. STEFFENSON: I would say that we are talking about the research and service programs and looking at the big problems in American education and those that can be treated in a Teacher Education program--and within that, all research, service, and training--including Teacher Corps.

DR. BUSH: Well, if we are concerned not just with the individual in the school system--teachers particularly--but with the context, then you have to include all these people if things are going to improve.

One lesson we have learned in recent years is that there is no single entry point.

DR. BILL SMITH: Would Dr. Gittell define the client? We've had questions both in terms of Teacher Corps and its specific legislation for teacher training and the rest of the Office of Education, in defining "client."

I heard Dr. Gittell say "the parent first and then the child," and I'd like to know what you specifically mean now so I can assess whether it fits the scheme that I have.

DR. GITTELL: I could be very specific if we go down to the individual school level, which I think is a great idea. At the individual school level, you can define clients very specifically--in terms of all of the parents of the students in that school. I said "students and parents" because when you reach junior high or high school, you can deal with the client directly, as well as with the parents. Hence the distinction.

On the lowest level, if you use the individual schools, then you have all of the parents in that school and there are a lot of possibilities and options (some operational, some never made operational) where the planning groups for the Teacher Training program can be made tri-part. This has not yet been done--although all these programs call for parental communication.

So, you situationally involve parents where they're never involved in the actual planning process of the program in terms of developing a teacher training program, either in-service or pre-service.

DR. GARTNER: Now, Marilyn, did you mean to combine the consumer--a word I prefer to client--and community? You slipped that one together.

DR. GITTELL: I said on an individual school level I can define community and client and the parents of those students. Now, obviously, the individual school level is the easiest place to deal with it. If you go to a larger area--and by the way, it's easier when you do in-service or pre-service training. When the size of the community becomes somewhat larger.

MR. MORRISON: I want to add to what you're saying. Over the past couple of years, we have institutionalized certain participation by various groups of parents; tri-part participation, parents, teachers, and administration.

For example, the PA was disbanded and a school organization developed. And now in place of the Executive Board of the Parents' Association, we have a Board of Directors, now composed of 11 parents and 11 staff people. That's a group through which we try to filter all important policy discussion before the administration makes decisions on them afterwards.

DR. GILLIN: What's PA?

MR. MORRISON: Parents' Association. The Board of Directors is in operation right now. There's another group, the Personnel Practice Committee, introduced by the Community School Board and developed by each school to suit its own style. They interview prospective teachers, which took some working through, too.

We now have parents and teachers, an equal number of both, and these meetings are open and anybody can join them. We all screened prospective teachers. After the screening is done, it's in my hands. But this is a place in which parents have a very decided input, though.

They have no control over firing. There are also many, many informal points of input. We've had things like long-term planning committees to plan changes in everything from curriculum to behavior, guidance, prejudice, what-have-you. And there's always a combination of parents, staff, and administration.

DR. OLSON: There are two remarks I want to make. One is on the definition of client or community.

Earlier in history, community participation or community control was somewhat more difficult than it is now. A number of States have laws on the books declaring that it's necessary to provide students in the State with a thorough and efficient education. New Jersey has such a law and other States, too. In England, failure to provide a thorough and efficient education has status in the courts as breach of contract on the part of the State. Peter Doe and the Iowa case are making the same point in this country. That's the first point.

The second point concerns the kind of committee you're talking about. I think there is individual support even in education quarters for community control of some sort.

The city of St. Paul has a system whereby parents not only screen teachers hired in the schools, but the State of Minnesota has established a relicensing process which includes the principal of the school, teachers within the school, and parents within the school.

That relicensing process evaluates the teacher's performance every five years. If a teacher is found wanting, that teacher is denied relicensing.

Big cities are inclined to endorse this as something that should be done generally, and the school administration groups connected with the study commission have endorsed the notion that there should be a probationary period in each of the five year periods in which there would be a diagnosis made prior to the relicensing, so that people have some sense of the skills needed to operate in the particular community.

And this could be connected with the same Teacher Corps training prior to relicensing. I think that kind of program would come in very conveniently in connection with what Dr. Smith was talking about.

MR. WOOD: Is relicensing an anomaly or a spreading thing?

MR. MORRISON: School administrators from States as far apart as Massachusetts and California are on our side. Some of them have it in place, others are putting it in place. I think Vermont has something similar. It exists in Massachusetts, but parents do not participate.

The Teacher Corps could exercise leadership here and get support from administrations and parents--and probably resistance from teacher unions.

But if you mobilize properly, you could make it stick.

MR. ENOS: In Minnesota, you must have fulfilled the State requirements in human relations (which is not a university course) and have certain competencies in human relations.

DR. CORRIGAN: This is a good example of where the Teacher Corps could make some progress. Paul gave Minneapolis as an example; you also have 13 States which now have professional licensing boards. The State legislature takes the responsibility for certification out of the hands of the State education department. And some of those board members are community people. They are primary weight on those boards--with either the union or the teachers' association acting as a balance.

There is a lot of thrust there: wherever you throw your weight, it's going to be controversial.

MR. ROTHBARD: It seems that we have slipped into discussion of solutions and away from the theme, which is supposed to be problems in education.

DR. BUSH: Well, community, clients, parents, consumers, all this is a problem area. It's been bothersome for some time and it's continuing to be bothersome.

In terms of what Teacher Corps has done in the last five or ten years in this whole area, are there significant changes that need to be called for, not in terms of solving the problem but in terms of emphasis?

MR. ROTHBARD: When you begin to discuss what the Teacher Corps has done, you discuss a solution identifying the client appropriately as the initial point in the planning process.

But as you talk about what Teacher Corps has done--you're also discussing the means to some end as yet undefined in response to the problem that we're not discussing.

DR. GARTNER: What should be the prescriptive items in a RFP? Is this a question on the agenda? We have come upon three big developments that are going to be in collision in the next decade.

One development concerns accountability, responsibility, the Griggs decision, the decision that particular entities (and it extends to the private sector) can't just go on saying, "We know what we're doing, we're going to keep doing it--just give us money."

The second development is popularly called "community participation," though I prefer the broader "consumer participation." The consumer says, "You can't muck around with us without inviting us to the table. Whether we end up making a decision or whether we just have an input, we've got a right to a say about these issues."

That's obviously related to accountability, and responsibility, but I think it's a separate issue.

And the third development; there is the large area of power, responsibility, irresponsibility--I don't want to judge it--of public employees. It's clear, today, and will be for a good long time, that those forces are in conflict.

And on policy issues, the Teacher Corps and other public programs, perhaps inadvertently, end up coming down on one side or the other. We should think about that consciously as we have implicity hoped to ride with the horses one and two. But we can't just do that without understanding horse three.

If we are serious about involving the whole community of those working in that school building, in numbers, horse three is a big part of it.

DR. BUSH: Let me add that with the passage of the Skull Act of California, horse three became important because the whole issue changed from emphasis on teacher accountability to all school personnel and school accountability.

We're probably going to see a movement toward holding the school rather than the individual accoutable--and this is going to change the emphasis.

That, I think, is the direction that's going to be taken, from many points of view, probably a more reasonable proposition in terms of the long-range results.

That doesn't mean we're going to have less emphasis upon developing teacher competence and having people be responsible for what they're doing, but it brings the different parties into better perspective.

MS. GERALD: I think you asked what the Teacher Corps' position had been in the past four or five years since we started the parent involvement?

DR. BUSH: I was trying to ask, "If this is an important nest of problems requiring high priority, then in what way were what kinds of issues and problems possibly not treated or not properly treated?" But if that's getting too much to solutions rather than to analysis of problems, then let's forget it.

MS. GERALD: I don't know if it's a solution. There may be certain activities which occurred in Teacher Corps that might be applicable to parent or community involvement in Teacher Corps.

I think there are, and perhaps some other people could speak with regard to this. Involvement probably varies from one parent representation on steering committees which may be active in decisionmaking or advisory boards to representation on a decisionmaking group in a Teacher Corps project--that may have at least 51 percent of the votes, if they go by votes. So, the range of involvement is probably very wide.

MS. DELANO: Appropos of what he just mentioned in passing on paradigms for accountability, I think what Penney Dyer and EPS have done in the New York City plan (somewhat changed from the original article in the Phi Delta Kappa about four years ago) truly involved all of these components in a good relationship.

If Teacher Corps is to move into a broader state of concern for these kinds of things, then we need to look at that kind of thinking, because it is outstanding.

DR. GITTELL: The State regulations for reaccreditation of teacher training institutions requires the development of this program--the three parts being involved in the development of it. However, there are very real problems in that which may be related more to what Teacher Corps could be doing.

First, it goes back to those questions when you define which community group or structure--such as the community school board, the local school board--should be involved in the development of the program which has been used in New York City.

In terms of definition, there was a major confrontation on the issue of teacher associations, because the union wants a regulation to require a recognized teacher association--which, of course, would have been in use.

The State Department of Education argued that it should be teachers within a school, not representatives of a district, not necessarily in an association. And that still has not been resolved at all. From what I have seen developing since I sat in one of the colleges and reviewed the programs, the rewriting of the field-based program under State regulations, has not, in my opinion, really taken the two components into consideration.

DR. BUSH: What do we know about the effect of community involvement or consumer involvement or client involvement in the affairs of a school? Or of the effect on the children and the achievement and performance, or any of the components of individual development? Do we know much about those?

DR. GITTELL: Well, since we don't have it, we can't know much. We haven't had a real laboratory evaluate what the impact would be because we never get far enough--because of political circumstances--to have this situation. I mean, of course, if you're talking about community involvement in decision making.

To the degree that we have that kind of operation in Detroit and New York, you have some selective models like the Roth demonstration schools where the achievement is the output--if that's what you're looking at as an output. I would not necessarily agree that that's what I would look at.

My own evaluation from New York and the demonstration district indicated that the output demonstrated changes in the way in which teachers were chosen and in the selection of types of training programs and in more innovation.

DR. BUSH: Right. So those are essentially output factors.

DR. GITTELL: Now, I could say to you that the one up in New York City concerning decentralization, but that would be a little bit devious on my part.

DR. BUSH: National and cross-national studies clearly suggest that when parental and school values are in harmony, there's greater achievement than when they are in conflict. Where the parents work in harmony with the values of the teacher, the kids get along and progress better in school.

There's clear evidence that greater congruence between home and school environment is essential for good education. I'm not saying which should change if there's conflict, but conflict means it's not working very well as far as the students are concerned

DR. BILL SMITH: Perhaps values other than reading or other testable scores are accomplished. In our situation, we have a decision making council with equal numbers of staff and parents. And probably the best result is that we have 40 or 50 percent volunteering in the school each week. Their involvement probably goes well beyond this decision making--they're involved with the ongoing problems.

DR. OLSON: A footnote to Dr. Gittell. Community involvement has not been tried very fairly, and in our early trials, we made some bad mistakes. One was community involvement without consumer education. Very few community controlled projects had significant presentations for the parents showing options available with respect to choice of teachers; education of the children; or the outcomes of any educational process.

Consumer involvement is not useful in any context without some sort of education.

DR. BUSH: You suggest that various methods and degrees of community or client involvement might be appropriate community training. Teacher Corps ought to find out what does and doesn't work and set up guidelines.

DR. OLSON: Present educational tools to the parents so they know what they're choosing.

DR. BUSH: Some perceptive member of the group passed up to me a summary of this discussion, which I will repeat for you. Three points: one: the big problem of the university's credibility to the community it deals with.

Two: the rapport between the local school administration and the community when the school administration fears the community.

Three: the suggested review of the teacher's role in home relationships. In each of these areas, there are significant problems.

In American education as compared with British education or education elsewhere, we're involved with parents up to our ears.

In the open school in Britain, the teacher occupies a much more respected and authoritative and status position than here, the relationship of home and school is quite different. We need to consider a variety of models rather than remain concerned with the traditional view--that we've an active parent-teacher association that gets parents involved and so forth. We all, in fact, know that the parent comes when called, when the kid is in trouble in elementary school, and it falls apart in secondary school. So we've got a long way to go until we get genuine involvement that brings parents and schools together.

DR. BILL SMITH: Are people's interest in a school adversely proportional to the effectiveness of the school? If they are satisfied, do they get involved?

MS. GERALD: There's a study that a sociologist named Hylan Lewis did in Washington, D.C., some ten years ago, and a book, "Tally's Corner" by Eliot Liebow, a field worker on this study. He said parents believed that schools were going to help make things all right for their children and that they sent their children to school in that belief.

If the schools are effective, then parents probably do not have much interest in changing or correcting things.

DR. BILL SMITH: Either Harris or Gallup asked a random sample of parents how they felt about schools. Eighty percent of them said the schools were fine. Another study asked the same question. Again, 80 percent of them said the schools were all right, they liked the teachers, and everything was fine.

DR. GARTNER: All they needed was more discipline.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: To what extent is the interest in community problems related to the fact that the American consumer has generally lost his influence and we are all frustrated.

Take medicine back in the 19th century. The surgeon operated within the home with soot on the windows to keep the neighbors from looking in. Often the head of the family got into an argument with the surgeon and had to call in the minister or the priest to reconcile the family and the surgeon so he could proceed. Today, if you try to interfere with the doctor, you're told to get yourself another.

And this is true of the carpenter, plumber, auto mechanic, or whatnot. Interfere--you're in trouble.

Now, this is due in large measure to specialization. The whole system is bureaucratic and specialized. There are times when discussion about community involvement can be considered valid and important for the public. If schools are discriminating against children, that's a public question, and the public has a legitimate right to correct it. If the meat market serves dirty meat, get State Inspectors. The public needs remedies for educational failure, too. I'm not ruling the public remedies out with respect to the schools, but we'd better think as to what is and what is not for the profession. And I think the Teacher Corps could do a lot to clarify the role of the profession.

DR. BILL SMITH: Remember that the Office of Education is a Federal bureaucracy. The extent to which it can make a commitment and carry it out is a very sensitive area.

And, therefore, as we talk about the question of community, I think we have to recognize the extent to which we're able to carry out commitments throughout all of the Office, no matter what the new legislation says about community, community schools, and the like.

The Teacher Corps is in a position to do things. We ought to make the distinction between consumer involvement and consumer education and then talk about models appropriate to dealing with the problems.

MR. WOOD: I wanted to ask Dr. Olson whether this discussion satisfies his topic of "Culture-based Education," or is that something else?

DR. OLSON: No, it's part of the process; and the problems we've discussed are particularly acute in nonmaintained cultural enclaves, like Northern Mexico or Indian reservations, where the schools are not succeeding in their roles. In many cases, they have 100 percent educational failures.

There are two things that they could do.

Include consumers in the process of redesigning schools. Frequently that doesn't fulfill the purpose, because the consumers demand--particularly in a colonized State--what they think the host society wants them to demand.

Secondly, you get confrontation situations--which you don't welcome. The teachers who go into these schools must be members of the culture or so immersed in it that there is a harmony between school and home.

And there are three issues: one is power. The second is the development of organization rapport between the school and the home.

And the third is the acculturization of the teacher to the culture of the home. Though these issues are conjoined, nuances separate them.

DR. BUSH: Any other problem areas?

DR. GILLIN: How can a teacher be client-oriented without being professionally-oriented? It has to go together. I'm truly interested in my client and I'm truly a professional and truly self-interested.

DR. CORRIGAN: You're dealing with the politics of control. You're dealing with career teachers on-site for 13 to 20 years, working in a community. They are members of teachers' unions or associations.

And on the national level, the same thing is happening: battles over the accreditation of teachers, national boards, and local boards. Preservice and inservice training are also involved. Teacher Corps is going to have to get in the middle of that.

DR. OLSON: A technical issue. American teacher education is still technically abysmal. No matter how well we solve political problems, how good a context is built and how integrated the community school and others are, we still don't have the capacity to train people to do even some fairly rudimentary things--let alone the more complex new teaching strategies.

And I think most of our funding for innovation has been withdrawn in the past simply for that reason.

We haven't learned to institutionalize the improvement of the technical capacity of the training of teachers. This should be a forefront issue; the rest doesn't count for much without it. We still don't know how to train teachers--regardless of what we're trying to train them for. We should push for developmental grant funding to effect the total institutional structure and the total teacher education-reeducation process--not for temporary systems off to the side.

MR. ROTHBARD: Dr. Olson, are you saying problems from the community to the university, saying these are prime, and we really have to examine the university also, as to the training it gives?

DR. JOYCE: Training can occur in any setting: it's not university versus community versus schools or inservice versus preservice. I don't know what the optimal institutional setting is.

MR. SNEDCOF: This university credibility issue: this frustration. You talk about a better relationship about preservice and inservice training. Well, by what vehicle? Competency, technical expertise, knowledge of learning theory or knowledge of teaching theory?

There's some place the schools of a community must turn to for this expertise. People come to us and say, "We're two or three people. We can't get any traction within our university; we lack money, and personal force."

Then what? Some teacher centers within universities have been useful. But this area is one of much frustration. Within Teacher Corps it's a most difficult area, because most programs are too small to increase their technical capacity greatly.

They build a better community base; they build a better consortium. But to increase their capacity to train more effectively is beyond the existing capacity of nearly every single project within the larger program. And that is a major problem.

DR. BILL SMITH: Why?

DR. BUSH: We hear that there is not sufficient capability in the Teacher Corps model, as it has operated, to impart the technical competence and expertise.

DR. JOYCE: Absolutely. The reasons are two--the program directors and project directors have to ride the bicycle while fixing it, and second, it requires an enormous amount of investment to make even a small technical input. A good example is that each minicourse, weak as they are, cost about $150,000. For a program to develop three or four training models requires more resources than they receive over two years. They just can't do it. They can't piece their personnel together, learn how to do it, develop the whole shooting match, and ride the bike at the same time.

Also, national technical capability has to be pluralistic, because it has to serve very different projects. You can't build a single Bureau of Research--1968 model--and use it throughout Teacher Corps and everywhere else--it would be bad if you could.

DR. GITTELL: You're saying we don't know if it works?

DR. JOYCE: We do not know how to train.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: I worked for over 30 years in a university that was not primarily interested in teacher training. It was interested in graduate research training; to prepare people to do dissertations.

The training of teachers was in the hands of underlings, largely student assistants. Big universities never trained individuals in a doctoral program to train teachers. Of these, 99 percent trained teachers but they were not prepared to do so, nor did they do the research they were trained to do.

DR. BUSH: Maybe that is where we get a division of labor as to what the Teacher Corps and what NIE should do because the development of training capability is expensive and time consuming, but we do know how to do it.

It takes time, energy, and collaboration: we should divide up the labor.

DR. PANKRATZ: The team leader in Teacher Corps who becomes a good teacher trainer could be a better teacher trainer than a college or a university. I'll put my 15 team leaders up against college teacher trainers...

DR. PROVUS: This division of labor sounds too quick: I don't think there should be a split between research and training because with people who can slide back and forth, in and out, and to and fro, you get a more effective, real world quality. Maybe someone will restate the division of labor point.

DR. BILL SMITH: Currently, the National Institute of Education is responsible for research and development; OE is responsible for demonstration programs or service programs.

And Dr. Bush was talking about the division of labor between two agencies to possibly deal with the problem together.

DR. BUSH: It doesn't mean one group does something here and another something there. There has to be collaboration, but you take prime responsibility for some part of a task and somebody else takes it for another part.

MR. WOOD: But I hear Dr. Joyce saying that whatever we do with Teacher Corps won't make much sense since we don't have basic research coming out. That requires large investments which are not likely to come down the pike.

DR. PANKRATZ: The Teacher Corps project can't develop the minicourse--and the schools can't develop the minicourse at $100,000 a piece.

DR. BUSH: They could--theoretically--if it didn't cost that much.

MS. DELANO: In the schools we had people being trained by City College faculty to do things that they hadn't done before. Teachers began to hook into kids' needs, into the families, into backgrounds, into the riches that families could and should bring into the schools; they found that there was just too much to do. The workshop became the place for people to meet. The workshop is becoming a different kind of institution. Those at City College, have compulsory courses in Spanish, for example.

But it's expensive to support workshops: it was $200,000 at City College. But through that, our advisors who were doing training in the schools, became partners with the faculty.

Some roles are now really interchanged; faculty are advising in the schools and teaching courses at the workshop, but it is a new breed.

MR. SNEDCOF: We're getting much more sophisticated: we're now talking about new roles, about political power being shifted around; who makes decisions about what--as well as trying to teach, trying to train, trying to deal with kids at the same time.

MR. WILLIAMSON: In terms of benefits delivered, it may cost less; your payoff on any variety of projects will be higher because of the substantial investments made in them.

DR. JOYCE: It's not just an issue of software development and training the program personnel. There is a unique possibility that a large number of projects meet communal needs.

Teacher Corps is faced each year with 150 or 160 brand new team leaders. For program directors to train new staff themselves when so many have communal needs, just doesn't seem to me to make good sense.

DR. BUSH: Why do you have that many each year.

DR. JOYCE: The guidelines prevent them from continuing beyond 2 years.

MS. GERALD: We interpreted the law that way.

DR. GARTNER: Let's go back. Dr. Bush feels we don't know enough about training. I do think that in wholes or in bits and pieces, we do some right things in teacher training programs. But, we are enormously wasteful when we try to save money.

Project directors cheat support staff if simultaneously they have to ride the bicylce and fix it and look where they're going simultaneously.

If we were a little smarter and gave more help and devices for support under the broad rubric for "technical assistance" we'd spend a little more money but get much more payoff for it.

Two statements were made: one, we don't know enough, and as I said, I have difficulty accepting that.

Two, we don't allocate resources to get maximum payoff. The guideline notions interest me. When the first Model Cities guidelines came out, people decided after long meetings not to dictate to projects--but to suggest activities; they suggested 20.

The first batch of Model Cities proposals had some 19 or 20 activities--19 if sponsors didn't understand one of the suggestions: 21 if they had an idea of their own. I'd like to propose some things that Teacher Corps people might think make sense, such as getting all the players involved in the game, not just the teachers, but the whole entity.

I'd suggest that a guideline or an RFP document say to the prospective applicant agency: an effective Teacher Corps program will involve a triadic relationship of schools, universities and community.

Goals can be achieved by this triadic relationship, often by having seats on a governing board given to the parents of the children, engendering commitment, involvement--ownership, if you will, in the program.

I think more on faith than on serious data of any sort that having parents have a sense of ownership is a positive contribution to the learning of children.

It's common sense that if school, community, and home are in consonance about an issue, the game will work better. I'd like to push people out in the field to have a sense of challenge around some of those issues. It shouldn't be that Teacher Corps says you ought to have apples, oranges, and kumquats, and only looks at proposals for apples, oranges, and kumquats. You might accept some of those, but you give more respect to proposals that struggle with alternative ways to meet needs.

DR. BUSH: How would you operationalize that?

DR. GARTNER: A Teacher Corps program goal might be to enable schools to redesign how they work with children, using personnel development methods.

The guidelines state that we believe an important way to achieve that change and improvement in the quality of that school is to establish a council that involves university, school, and community.

A document accompanying the RFP would state the overall goal and a number of procedural steps or components believed to be appropriate towards achieving improvement via participation.

Proposals will be required to include satisfactory descriptions of each of those components or to propose alternative methods to achieve ends. And as a footnote--that most favorable consideration will be given to proposals that struggle creatively with those issues.

DR. BILL SMITH: What difficulties would you see in your proposal if you deleted other operational mechanisms specifying elements that must be taken into account. Suppose it were left to the proposer to work out his own structure?

There are a finite number of ways in which community personnel and other elements can relate. The number is small--you wouldn't need to suggest an element unless the legislation calls for it.

MR. ARDIKE: Dr. Gartner, how would this differ from the current state of affairs? There may be elements that the Teacher Corps feels a project should include--but how projects are planned varies from site to site. Even to say we have a Teacher Corps program is a misnomer; no two projects really resemble one another. A diversity--or alternative--you're describing for the future exists at present.

DR. GARTNER: From the outside they do look alike.

DR. PANKRATZ: As a proposal writer, I want to know the criteria on which those ten people evaluate my proposal.

Give me those criteria before I write the proposal: don't make them up later. If those criteria produce the end results in terms of ideas discussed here today, then we're in shape. We must specify what we want to achieve by whatever design I can come up with hereafter.

DR. BUSH: Time is short; we need a five-minute summary of where we are.

MR. WIGGINS: The critical factor is the ability of the Teacher Corps staff to be able to discuss their potential, not what seems to be successful or what combination of factors in what proportion may lead to a certain kind of outcome.

Most critical is the inability of proposals to specify outcomes, and how the outcomes would be achieved.

DR. GILLIN: I'm very interested in this whole process of proposal writing, it consumes three-fourths of the time of the best people in a program. There's a need for preliminary funding with help from people who understood your objectives and could clarify your thinking--the way the ETS and early childhood groups did for us, working with us on a constant basis.

DR. WOOD: You are suggesting a contract phase often used in the Defense Department in which project definition, then development, and then implementation get segmental funding.

MR. SNEDCOF: There's a problem in that approach, but it's a strong point, the need for a lot of money to bring something off in such a flexibly written guideline.

I'm not sure, when you say, "We know some things work and others don't", how you can simultaneously encourage a flexible approach. It sounds appealing, but I think it needs work.

DR. GARTNER: I think that's true.

DR. OLSON: One of your earlier points--teaching as a profession. There's a very good book by Amitai Etzioni, called "Teaching as a Semi-Profession," in which he argues that we have not identified intellectual paradigms which allow fixed interventions to produce fixed consequences in teaching. Such rigor defines a profession.

This is not to disagree with Alan Gartner's remark. Some lawyers have looked at the convention CBTE protocols and, so far as they can tell, the protocols will not stand up in the courts. Job descriptions are not sufficiently accurate. Validation in terms of teacher behavior alone is rather inconsequential for children: and present validation doesn't take in parents' designs.

The courts declared in New York in the Mercado cases that assessment of competence should be based on the judgments of parents, teachers, and supervisors rather than on an analytic schedule. The Mercado case involved principals. We have to look very closely at whether we are a profession or not. If we are a semi-profession, if the courts can respect the commonsense judgment of parents, then we are not looking for a "science" but for a "deliberative process" for educating teachers and deciding who teaches.

The second issue has to do with reform. The Teacher Corps is only interested in project reform--in which I'm not very interested. Rather we have to consider a major method of American teacher education that has to do with the whole undergraduate output in 1970, 1971, 1973, 1978.

Teacher education candidates in 1969-1970 in American universities did not see themselves as intellectuals, or particularly interested in ideas. Many did not think they were learning much in college relevant to their careers; they had very few interesting courses. Most had poor counseling relationships with their professors and were not invited to their homes. In all, teacher education is an appallingly underfunded, demoralized institution.

In the next five years we must put our money behind those institutions, and not simply a project grant for a little sideshow--not affecting main functions.

DR. STEFFENSEN: Dr. Olson, what's the potential for making reform or changes in competencies of teachers now in service?

DR. OLSON: A good potential. Certain powerful mechanisms we can work on--entry and exit mechanisms, licensing mechanisms, assessment mechanisms, manpower allocation mechanisms are becoming much more significant. I am not sure that inservice training by itself can do much.

DR. STEFFENSEN: Where should our marginal money go? Should we give up on teachers with 15 years to go?

DR. OLSON: No. We should confront the notion that some people might as well be "Teacher Corpsed" out of the profession, or be delicensed. If we refuse to talk about counseling people out, we're not speaking realistically. We're not going to just train, train, and train the people until somehow they get to be beautiful!

DR. JOYCE: Up till now, I agreed with you on about teachers. Their average IQ is around 115--a standard deviation or more above the average. For a population of two and one-quarter million, that's as good as we're going to do. I don't believe teachers are worse than the population as a whole or that a profession that big is going to be improved vastly.

They are us: all of us, a society we live and help towards self-improvement--though some aren't amenable or willing to learn or change. But compared to the population as a whole, teachers--for such a large group--are a very good group.

DR. OLSON: I don't think we have evidence to support that. In terms of the job-needed accomplishments, and who they are, the incompatabilities are greater than they should be. Even Shanker says that. In speaking of some experienced teachers' limitations, I was not speaking of all American teachers. I think, because of the NEA and the AFT, the Federal government has been reticent to say that counseling out may also be connected to training. Covertly or overtly, that ought to be said. The unions which have a sense of pride might even support that notion.

DR. JOYCE: I agree. Retraining is essential--we are not going to replace the teacher population--though weeding out should be, as suggested--part of the game.

No pool of potential teachers exists substantially better than our present pool.

MR. ROTHBARD: The Chairman of the National Council of Education Research discussed the trade-off of technology to labor, in moving the education profession from a teacher-centered to a student-centered field. It ties in with a decline in management.

MR. WOOD: Would you amplify that--"use of technology" and "student-centered"?

MR. ROTHBARD: If you have not been doing significant things because of the quality of the available people, then you have to start looking at tradeoffs among your inputs, and one is the use of technology.

MR. WOOD: Using machines instead of people?

MR. ROTHBARD: Saying that if you are missing returns then you look at the trade-off.

MR. WOOD: Not instead of, but to support them.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

DR. CORRIGAN: What does "trade-off" mean? What does it mean in this context.

MR. ROTHBARD: You have to look at technology. It's not a question of getting rid of teachers, but more of the general population should be brought into education--into adult education and so on. It's not a net of fewer teachers, but existing teachers are going to be working with larger percentages of population.

DR. GARTNER: The standard model of assessing the productivity or effectiveness of particular human services is essentially an industrial model.

We are laggard in dealing with reality. We are a service society in any serious measure of the work force, but in using measures like Gross National Product, we misstate the contribution of services. Take, for example, the contribution of education to the GNP. Education doesn't have a final market price, the way steel has. Yet, the teacher is paid and every time the teacher's salary goes up, education's contribution to the GNP increases. But who would seriously suggest that the contribution that education makes is in any significant way related to the teacher's salary?

Similarly, when we try to "improve the services", we apply notions that are derived from a goods production base. We talk about making them more capital intensive, technologizing them, "Tailorizing" of them, and restructuring them.

It simply isn't going to work. The evidence is clear that this is not the appropriate way to make services work. The way to look at services--particularly education, a human service--is as consumer-intensive.

The difference between human service work and production work is that in service work, the consumer (student, client, or patient) is a worker in the production of the end product.

The student is either a passive recipient of what the teacher does (a lot of teaching but not much learning) or an active worker in his or her learning.

The way to increase teacher productivity is not to tag an ETV or other RCA idiocies onto that teacher but to aid the teacher in getting the kids to work harder--more productively--at their own learning.

Think about programs where teachers facilitate peer counseling and children teaching children. That's the way to increase the teacher's productivity: don't demand that teachers teach more.

The whole push comes out of educational television, at best a minor adjunct. To increase productivity in education, do not go the industrial factor route, but catch the heart of the services sector--the role of the consumer.

Let's look at smoking and drinking, the illnesses most characteristic of our advanced society: illnesses less a function of disease and what the doctor does, but much more a function of what the consumer wishes to do. Now, these are illnesses amenable to consumer involvement; what the parent will do to maintain or capture health when ill. The same issue is involved when we want to get kids to be more productive and teachers more productive.

DR. JOYCE: It seems to me that when we talk about technology and education, there are three major areas where technology can be applied.

One is better utilization of people; differentiating staff more effectively to bring about a better interchange between teacher and learning.

At a dehumanized level, this is an assembly line kind of thing; a humanistic level, it is an attempt to create settings in which people can get different kinds of education productively. I would hate to see that kind of use of technology stereotyped as being only industrial.

Secondly, we have the possibility of training teachers, helping them to become more effective, and that has technological aspects either dehumanizing or productive.

Teachers could improve their skills through their own options or in terms of their superiors' options or others, and that is not necessarily dehumanizing.

And third, recognition that children teach themselves in a variety of ways, in which different combinations of human beings can be brought together in various ways.

One problem we have in arguing about the teacher, his training, and technology is that we think of teaching as something in a classroom of 30 kids and one adult.

We add television to replace the teacher: but we can construct varieties of educational environments in which many technologies are brought together in different ways; we really have a lot of possibilities. But I would hate to see technology run everything.

I was a consultant to a research group which invented a microfilm device which could carry a year-long reading course called "Ticket" into our American classrooms.

Once in American classrooms they would "Ticket" the world. That is what we are against. But through the same technological application, children can have available to them practically all known data about our social ecology, and could use it on demand to support their inquiries.

And that I am for.

DR. CORRIGAN: Back to values again. I would opt for teaching all the knowledge available on ecology, creating new kinds of schools where kids develop a sense of community.

You might have very small units; not thousand-student elementary schools. If we are really talking about different kinds of strategies in relation to specific values, we might go on other routes. Instead of assuming "bigger is better", we might demonstrate that "smaller is better."

We might want to be less technology oriented and train more for human interaction--a whole different school environment; you might not want to build the kind of schools that we have built before with all this new technology... We might not want to place 3000 students in five floors of three acres of brick and mortar.

DR. BUSH: You sound like Luddites at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. They destroyed the new technology because it was going to throw them out of work. This conversation bothers me: it has a Luddite flovor.

DR. CORRIGAN: What makes you uncomfortable?

DR. BUSH: Developing technology makes possible the transmission of information and off-loading the burden from teachers' backs so that education can be humanized in the way that you are talking about. If we are hostile toward the new technology and fight it, we go no place.

DR. CORRIGAN: I am not hostile but we have justified big schools because physics labs and advanced equipment cost so much. You've got to put 3,000 kids in the same place to justify cost. In fact 23,000 people. Some towns in Vermont don't have 3,000 people. Technology and resource issues can create environments in which it is very difficult to develop any sense of community.

DR. BUSH: But with new technology mountain state rural schools can have things brought to them that they could never have before.

DR. CORRIGAN: If we develop systems where technology doesn't create environments antithetical to community, then that's fine. But that ought to be a criterion on which to judge the technology. We haven't used it that way.

DR. GARTNER: Right. Too often we have let economy govern.

DR. JOYCE: One thing: there is an interesting dissertation at Columbia by Henry Hector on teacher depreciation. He shows that teachers improve in their first five years out, and after that, they decline--except in the few cases where they are transfered and improve slightly toward the end of their careers. Add to Seymour Harrison's picture of the average school, the daily demands on teachers and you have some sense of why people depreciate, wear out. If the teacher is part of the child-rearing process, the teacher needs time off to go into the other systems of the community to ascertain what adult competence is.

DR. PANKRATZ: It is not only teachers; universities have the same problem; people are not part of a continuing, learning community. Teacher Corps isn't going to create an opportunity for universities and teachers to continue to be in a learning community.

Right now, I have 50 outdated, obsolete faculty in the College of Education. I've got to do something with them.

DR. BUSH: We are supposed to meet tomorrow at 9:00 in small groups. Do we still want to meet as a total group in the morning for a little while?

DR. GILLIN: Yes. There is a real gap between the tenor of this discussion and the categories in the small groups.

DR. BILL SMITH: I am not task-oriented. I am enjoying the open session immensely. I know Russ Wood is task-oriented...

DR. BUSH: We will have a definitive statement of tomorrow's program before the morning meeting.

(Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the proceedings were adjourned, to reconvene at 9:00 a.m., July 24, 1974.)

TEACHER CORPS PLANNING CONFERENCE

- - -

Round Table

on

Teacher Corps Planning

- - -

Belmont, Maryland

24 July, 1974

CONTENTS

Page

9:25 a.m. Session 69

Statement submitted by
Dr. Marilyn Gittell 121

PROCEEDINGS

DR. BUSH: The persons designated to lead the small groups met this morning and will report after we have some clarification on what the Teacher Corps is and where it is going. Our de jure and de facto leader, Dr. Smith, will speak on that topic.

DR. BILL SMITH: Historically, Teacher Corps had two basic objectives: to strengthen educational opportunities for children in areas having concentrations of low income families and to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation.

Note that we have Education Professions Development Act authority, meaning that our client is not the child, but the teacher or intern.

The third piece of legislation is new, and if passed, will aid institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve training and retraining programs for education personnel. But the existing Senate-House conference report doesn't give us carte blanche on education personnel.

The legislation restricts the program to retrain experienced teachers and paraprofessionals, primarily because we had not had a hearing by Dellenbach and O'Hara, the chairmen of the House subcommittees, before Quie and Brademan introduced their bills.

The only person who had submitted any legislation on the Senate side as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was Senator Nelson.

So, where the legislation says education personnel, it is restricted to experienced teachers and paraprofessionals.

We had indicated that the training of adminastrators--the school principal--was critical to the whole program. The senior conference staff person gave us an interpretation that we may be able to use. Under the definition "team leader," the administrator is part of the design, which means that we would have the administrator in the training program as a team leader in that school.

A fourth piece of legislation would support demonstration projects for retraining experienced education personnel serving in local education agencies. We have received authority for demonstrations, but we haven't seen the conference report and don't know what is specified. As soon as it comes out we will know to what extent we can interpret the term "demonstration."

Those are the four basic authorities we may have when the conference report is completed and the President signs a bill.

- - - - -

As of this year, we have five regional recruitment centers in Georgia, Washington, D.C., Nebraska, Michigan, and California. They are responsible for recruitment and for sharing data on applicants with other centers, for helping with interviews, and the like. They help new projects in the orientation of interns, and visit sites to help ensure that projects have met all of the requirements for recruitment and placement of interns.

DR. JOYCE: Do projects also recruit their own interns?

DR. BILL SMITH: Initially in Teacher Corps, recruitment was done nationally. But Congresswoman Edith Green insisted that this should be a decentralized program, open to local decisions about people who are applying. Therefore, the recruitment of interns could be, and should be, a function of the local project.

As a result more recruits come from local advertisement--through the university or the school system--than through national recruitment. But national recruitment provides the names of potential candidates to any project that is seeking applicants.

DR. BUSH: Who makes the final decision as to who to admit?

DR. BILL SMITH: It is left up to the local project.

DR. JOYCE: With the local project is it the director, or who?

DR. BILL SMITH: Usually a team. Everybody, of course, recognizes that the intern is going to spend the two inservice years in the school under the authorization of the school and, therefore, it is necessary for the school superintendent to view the interns as employees.

DR. CORRIGAN: A comment on national and local recruitment--if you buy the idea that you are in a particular school or a community to try to help the community reform it, you've got to try and take as many people from the school or district as you can--that is, if you want "grass roots" reform that will effect the entire community and a long-term effect after Teacher Corps pulls out.

DR. BILL SMITH: Yes.

DR. CORRIGAN: Then, national recruitment for experienced people is a completely different notion.

DR. BILL SMITH: There will still be national recruitment of preservice interns--only in smaller numbers.

But both the House and the Senate require that we continue with the Teacher Corps teams, which include an intern. So every demonstration project, whether it has heavy emphasis on inservice or not, will have interns in it.

If we reduce the number of recruitment centers, we will still provide opportunities for anybody to get involved, but they will do exactly as they did in the past; apply at a specific project site. But there will be fewer interns getting in, simply because we will have a smaller number.

DR. CORRIGAN: Will there be any experienced people recruited from outside the district?

DR. BILL SMITH: No. The experienced people who are recruited are those that the system may recruit as a team leader, or in some other capacity, but not as part of a team. We ought to look at the problem that exists in the place that has the existing staff already.

I have no confidence that simply opening up a school and bringing in committed volunteers with all the ingredients that make for success is the way the Teacher Corps ought to be going. We need to address what happens in a school with the people who are already there. That is what we should be moving toward now.

In Louisville, which had a Teacher Corps, a COP, and urban rural program, the superintendent of schools decided that 14 schools in the low income area would be restaffed, restructured, and the like, and did it.

The problem was that after succeeding in this and having very dynamic teachers on the staff, they were forced to desegregate, and take the hand-selected staff which had made commitments and shift them all over the city.

What this did was, in effect, to institutionalize the training process. The people from those 14 schools demanded through their union that the same kind of training that they had in the 14 schools be given to them when they went to the new schools.

Now, that is serendipitous and certainly good. But we are not in a position to know exactly how a school can be reconstituted simply by shifting the players; you don't know what the circumstances are going to be because of frequent change.

So, I would much prefer to deal with a school as is, in situ, and build from there.

Now, the structure: the beauty of the Teacher Corps is that under HEW, under the Assistant Secretary, under the U.S. Office of Education, the Teacher Corps authority specifically states that the Director of Teacher Corps must report directly to the Commissioner of Education.

We have Dick Graham to thank for that. It's the most comfortable experience I have ever had. As you know, under the HEW, there is an Assistant Secretary for Education, Virginia Trotter. She has three major units independent of each other, but sisterly in their relationships--the Office of Education, NIE, and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.

Our information system flow is from the Commissioner to the Director, and then the monitoring through staff, the management process through information systems, and the planning and development process at the local level. And we see it as a closed-loop that allows for an up and down information flow that provides assistance to us and helps projects at the local level.

Now, in terms of Federal relationships, we work with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Model Cities, the National Institute of Education, the Office of Child Development, other OE bureaus and the Peace Corps.

We have two Peace Corps-Teacher Corps projects--one in Afghanistan, and the other in Africa. We had five last year. We expect to continue this in some form next year. Interns did one year of training in the Teacher Corps, but were initially selected by Peace Corps; then they had a two-year experience in the host country. They are going to school there, and when they return they will have completed their master's degrees and will be able to funnel back into education.

The government tie-ins with Federal agencies, institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, regional offices and State educational agencies are not always typical tie-ins.

We do not have the authority to put funds in State educational agencies, although we work closely with them. Our authority specifically states that we can fund institutions of higher education or local educational agencies with the exception of our correctional authority, which allows us to go to other kinds of agencies.

The other area is that of the regional offices of the Office of Education. We do not have any official working relationship with the regional offices except for the collegial relationships and the information relationships.

DR. BUSH: How can you escape that?

DR. BILL SMITH: Actually, Russ Wood is to be credited with that.

We are destined to be part of the regional office, as part of the decentralization plan. That is why the word "demonstration" is very important--a rationale from the basic HEW policy documents that distinguishes decentralized from centralized programs.

As a result, we got a commitment from the Commissioner that, with the new legislation which gave us the demonstration authority, we were eligible to be considered as a non-decentralized program.

- - - - -

In terms of local directions, the kind of involvement that is required must have community interns, parents, schools, students, teachers and universities in our regular program, and mixes thereof.

We make the administrative policy, we provide the development assistance either directly or through what we call networking (known as the shared experience bank) in which project directors within a State or within a region, like the New England region, work on common problems and share information already gleaned from their individual projects. Paul Collins, present here, is coordinator and facilitator for the New York network. Those of you who would like to know all about networking should see Paul.

We have program guidelines until this year. We expect that we can have guidelines still, but it requires a clearance through the Office of Management and Budget and the regulations people.

Russ Wood, in the basic draft of the legislation that we sent to OMB, proposed that we had the authority to make guidelines. The conference did not include this because they gave us only what they thought would be minimal needs.

And we accept that, but I think that we will be able to have guidelines. We did not have them in the ninth cycle, and Caroline Gillin (who was responsible for putting together the ninth-cycle operation) can attest that it was difficult for applicants historically accustomed to stringent guidelines from the Teacher Corps to put their projects together.

This may be the best year we have had. There is greater diversity than could be imagined, simply because we did not lay on what we had laid on before. It will be a test for where we are going and what we are about. Our job is to administer the legislation that Congress gives, and that is what we attempt to do.

- - - - -

We are particularly interested in management information systems, and we are working on a couple of strategies. We have the funds, but it will be 1976 before we get all the pieces together and get data out.

We are working on another strategy where we can provide at least first-level training for projects in development of the management information system. We did a trial run on one in the Southwest with Ray Mazone a few years ago, and the data on the effectiveness of that management information system is just coming in. We have some experience to draw upon. Project monitoring is all done from the Washington office--and that is the depth of our program. The program specialists are responsible for monitoring the projects.

Through the work that Clarence Walker is doing with selected project directors, we are looking at the role of the project officer as he or she moves out into monitoring in terms of what the office and the project needs. We have been very encouraged by what we have learned that the projects feel to be successful work done by the project officers, and we are encouraged to find that there are specific things we can work on to make monitoring more effective.

We see the monitoring tied very closely to management information. But one of the big problems we face as bureaucrats is the notion that when we act we always represent money and a go/no-go kind of things, rather than a developmental or facilitating kind of service, but we are trying to move toward greater facilitation and less bureaucratic monitoring and evaluation. We think that technical assistance is part of what we might ask people in the field to provide to each other, whether it comes out of the disciplines, out of R&D, or simply out of the process one project has developed.

We normally use the Ballantine rings to describe what we call the paradigm notion. There is a point where all three intersect, and then there is a point where just two of them intersect.

The LEA and the community can interact without necessarily involving the institution of higher education, and the institution of higher education and the LEA can interact. There is also an interaction between the community and the institution of higher education.

Now, this paradigm notion talks about the involvement of all three in some specific areas. The overlap area is where conflict-resulting or conflict-producing collaboration, which we are particularly interested in, is going to develop. Conflict is healthy and collaboration is a political process and it takes place in the overlap area.

But there are special competencies that only the school has, and the community, and the IHE have competencies outside the domain of the other two. These ought to be considered from a non-negotiable point of view as a function of each participant institution.

But where there are overlaps we ought to talk about tradeoffs. For example, the local education agency is responsible for the safety of pupils. That is a technical competency that doesn't involve the IHE or the community. A school or a university can tell a parent that it is sensible for a student to eat breakfast, but the decision as to whether or not that student has breakfast is a function of the parent. Now, the school may want to act, but the decision as to whether that child does or does not have breakfast is the parent's.

- - - - -

Types of projects. We have bilingual and bicultural projects, community and volunteer projects. Separate authority allows us to include community representatives and parents as paid volunteers in projects.

This is good because it allows us to deal with community-based education in a real sense, because we have resources--limited though they may be--for doing so.

We have corrections projects and we have developmental projects. Our staff had taken the position that anything that we were doing developmentally ought to be related directly to and serving a project.

So, what we have attempted to do in projects with people who can deliver a specific developmental process or a product, is to add additional resources (called a developmental project) to the existing project. The developmental project may not necessarily be run by the project director, but is under his supervision.

For example, in Wisconsin, site of an original CBTE model, we were particularly interested in stating: "If you tell us that you can build a model, that you need one and have the capacity to build it, and if you can tell us what it takes and how much it costs to build, and the process for building--then we are willing to provide resources totally unrelated to the project for you to build with. We took the position that if they couldn't use the model right then, then we shouldn't fund it.

If they are not ready to use the model for three years, we should not talk about its relationship to that project until we have given it an opportunity to be developed. The project staff came up with a model. They documented the process. As a matter of fact, they had a "Report of Negative Findings." The documentation shows they tried three times. With the third attempt they decided to give back the money because they couldn't resolve the decision-making process within their own organization. They had three mathematicians attempting to build a math model, each wanting to do his own thing. They finally went to an independent decision-maker whose policy they agreed to abide by. Once past that they developed the model. There are a number of development activities that emerged from that effort. We spent about a million dollars in developmental activities tied to projects.

We have Indian projects which are primarily rural. You won't see Indian in the statistics on bilingual projects, but check our rural statistics. You will find it under the rural and urban-rural combined Indian projects.

We have multi-cultural projects--Peace Corps, rural and urban projects. We run preschool, elementary, middle school, secondary and alternatives; alternatives both in terms of corrections and in terms of other kinds of institutions.

Major thrusts include alternative training designs, collaborative decision-making, community-based education, systematic management, training complexes,and teacher centers, and the portal school notion.

- - - - -

The history of Teacher Corps over the first nine years involves 358 projects. By projects we mean sites. There were 358 specific sites where there were Teacher Corps projects over the nine-year period.

In some places we stayed five years; in others, six; in others, two; in others, perhaps nine. We were involved in 49 States. This year Guam and the District of Columbia have projects, but only two of the 50 States don't have projects. Over the nine-year period we have touched 49 States, 406 universities and 711 school districts. In the nine-year history we have trained 10,830 interns.

In terms of the proportion of dollars spent, 28 percent was for the bilingual projects; 25 percent for undergraduates (not that the Teacher Corps ought to be in the undergraduate business because we impose too many program demands on interns who are juniors and thrust them into educational settings with too many demands because of the two-year time constraint.) We also have 7% combination--graduate, undergraduate projects--65% urban; 16% rural; and there are combinations of urban and rural projects, with Indian projects heavily in the rural category.

DR. CORRIGAN: I would like to disagree with your point that undergraduate programs are too early to start with professional preparation. I think you ought to go right down to high school.

DR. BILL SMITH: We don't have the authority, thank goodness! It might be advantageous to talk about it later.

DR. PANKRATZ: You talked about the 10,000 interns. I'll mention that through the process significant numbers of experienced teachers are being trained also.

DR. BILL SMITH: Yes, but unofficially. This year a ruling by Legal Counsel stated that an experienced teacher who was a cooperating teacher could audit classes, but we could not provide resources to involve them as a legitimate partner.

The fact that we don't officially involve the cooperating teacher is the greatest weakness of the program right now. We have never included the administrator as part of the team. He has always resented the mavericks, especially in '68 and '69 when the student counterculture was so evident--resenting authority and not having an option to be involved in it.

For the tenth cycle we expect to fund about 40 projects. We will continue the ninth cycle. Teacher Corps, as it now stands, funds two-year projects. Projects are funded for one year and are automatically funded for a second year in a two-year project cycle.

But each year a new series of projects is funded. This is a yearly national competition. For example, a 7th project in its second year of operation may apply for a 9th cycle project. The new project series, cycle nine, is a national competition. Thus, regardless of performance in an earlier project cycle, all applicants must compete for funding with each new series of projects.

DR. PANKRATZ: Are you going beyond 40 new starts for cycle 10?

DR. BILL SMITH: Yes, but we don't know what projects may look like. We may change it. I understand that phase funding was discussed yesterday. Phase funding means that no money can be left unobligated. It may mean that we need to do phase funding with a larger number of projects, so that other kinds of arrangements can take place.

Here are figures to give you a sense of where we were and where we are. When we had $9.5 million we had a staff of 62. With a current authorization of $37.5 million we have a staff of less than 40. The more money we got, the less staff we had. For the last three years we have been at a $37.4 million ceiling. This year 37.5; next year, 37.5; '76, at least 37.5.

The present legislation provides two-year programming to interns only; nothing for technical assistance and program evaluation. The focus was on teaching and the stipends were constant--$90 plus $15.

What we are hoping to move toward--and when we say future legislation, we are not talking about what is in the conference report, but what was original in the Nelson, Quie and Brademas bill--is to move to five year projects, not necessarily having interns remain as interns for the five-year period, but having interns in a two-year program and then move them into the school as part of the experienced team and continue inservice training over a five-year period.

That way, we go to a site once; we give them a five-year period as a maximum. It could be shorter in some places because their level of readiness may be quite different. Once we have been we don't go back.

Now, one of the advantages of Teacher Corps is that having gone back a couple of times we have built a constituency, a very powerful constituency, committed to Teacher Corps.

The program design allows us to have a constituency, but it is not as broad because we are staying longer than the two-year period, but in fewer places.

In cycle 10 we are talking about the total staff, even though it is quasi-administrative. There is provision for a 10 percent set aside for technical assistance, developmental assistance, and program evaluation and monitoring. The focus is on demonstration rather than on teaching, on demonstration of quality teaching techniques.

We were able to get the stipend in this legislation changed from $90 to $150--with the decision left to the Commissioner--but with a ceiling of $150.

DR. BUSH: Did I hear you say that the five-year thing is not renewable?

MR. WOOD: The five years applies really to the membership term of an individual Teacher Corps member. It allows us to cover, for example, a paraprofessional who came in and needed four or five years to get certification. It doesn't restrict us legislatively to five-year, or six-year, or two-year, or three-year projects. We have flexibility on that.

Administratively, we have been planning to have projects up to five years, but it is not a legal restriction.

DR. PANKRATZ: What are the major guidelines on program design?

DR. GILLIN: This year it is quite public, the specific things required in programs have been published in two Federal Registers.

DR. BILL SMITH: We specified three or four things in the ninth cycle. There must be a design whereby all interns will be trained in identification, diagnostic, and prescriptive techniques for children with learning and behavioral problems. You must provide teachers going into low income areas with the processes by which they identify, diagnose, and prescribe learning activities for children with learning and behavioral problems.

DR. GILLIN: You have to identify in some way the competency that teachers and interns will be working towards. You have to have an examination system; community involvement; a community-based program; shared government and a needs assessment.

DR. JOYCE: What is a needs assessment?

DR. GILLIN: Well, it is written very ambiguously and you had to point out why you needed a project, why you are leaving your area for a Teacher Corps project. That didn't mean you had to say that you had poverty schools. You had to relate the training of teachers and interns to the kind of situation you had in the schools and the universities.

You had to have a basis for all these priorities. There are 14 general provisions and about 6 other more specific provisions.

DR. JOYCE: How much of the project's design and management procedure is described by guidelines like these elements?

DR. BUSH: My sense is that 75 or 80 percent of what they do they are doing in frameworks of some sort, they were told they had to have.

DR. BILL SMITH: Yes. I was going to say about 90 percent.

DR. PANKRATZ: I think in the last two years, in seventh and eighth cycles they have tried--eighth and ninth cycles--they have tried to be more flexible.

But if you go back and read sixth and seventh cycle guidelines, it is a very structured document. Proposals got to be 400 pages long, to make sure they included not the 19, but the 125 specific items that were listed in the guidelines. I know of project directors who had to write a couple of hundred pages of amendments.

But you could still have some freedom and flexibility. When we came to Teacher Corps with ideas of what we wanted to do, they always let us do it. They were really good about that, though the emphasis on shared government, the emphasis on a triangular management system and CBTE was important.

Some of the directions and innovative things happened because people insisted that projects have shared government systems that work. That has not been all bad.

DR. BUSH: I think the thing asked for here is as clear a delineation as possible of requirements at the various levels before this thing gets to the local level. That would be very useful for planning purposes.

DR. GILLIN: What do you mean, "various levels"?

DR. BUSH: Well, what is required at HEW; what is required at OD; what is required at the teachers' center?

DR. BARRY: In preparation for this meeting, I did a taxonomy of a local project, an outline which stipulates what happens under management, what happens under program design, what happens under the role of the IHE, the role of the community. I don't know how many of you have seen it. It would be very appropriate now, because I tied into it the exceptional child job component--the need to have representation from special education on the steering committee (a very important component in the operation of the local projects) and the coordination of the exceptional child program, and so on.

DR. PANKRATZ: But this is not true for all projects. You may have shared government, but not every project has an internal council as such; not every project has a community committee apart from a policy board or steering committee.

DR. BARRY: Right. But these are patterns, too, and the fact that it is not literally true of every project is not important. This is the basic operation as we observe it in the field. There are variations on the theme.

DR. STEFFENSEN: We have to remember now that there are certain criteria; a number of those are set at the Commissioner's level and apply to every program.

We operate below that at two levels. One is the application form itself. This year, for the first year, we had to go to the same application form that every program in the Office used, with certain deviations recognizing the uses of the program. One, for example, was the needs assessment part of the application. Then, the department criteria themselves. How do you look at proposals after they have been reviewed by the application board. There is no latitude there.

DR. BUSH: Well, at least the discretionary responsibility is at your level.

DR. STEFFENSEN: Yes.

DR. BILL SMITH: This year we are going to try to add the question of contracts. Currently a school system can't come in for a Teacher Corps project without a university; and a university can't come in without a school system. They have to come in jointly.

But we've been talking about the possibility of having contractual arrangements with the university and grant arrangements with the local educational agency. We thought we could go to grants totally, but OMB circular E102 may prevent that.

We also have a community request to be a prime contractor. And we can't do that because the resources we have put into the community volunteer component are really much smaller than the other operations elements.

DR. OLSON: If the three overlapping circles are to mean anything, the contracting arrangements which are representative of that division still have to be developed.

A contracting system simply of reciprocal contracts between the Office of Education, the school, and the IHE will still effectively leave the community out of later operations because they have not been part of the negotiations and have no tools. In developing systems for signing on and contracting, you have to include them on the contract.

DR. BUSH: There should be a warning in your discussion that if you continue to bring about unified or cooperative efforts between LEA and institutions of higher education, and if you contract with one and grant with the other, there will be trouble.

Now, last night our consensus was that categories proposed for breaking into subgroups of project design, evaluation, dissemination, et cetera; didn't mesh with problems identified in earlier discussion. An alternative for our first subgroups might prove more congruent with our problem issues and the major needs in education and teacher education.

So we attempted, following the plenary session last night, to come up with a summary. And we have a five-fold category which I'd like to offer to you to modify or accept as you will be allocated to them.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: What is proposed here is a change in the substance of the agenda, based on areas discussed yesterday.

One: recruitment and selection of trainees.

Two: training in classroom operations; i.e., development of knowledge and skills.

Third: training--knowledge and skills needed--to work with the community, with parents, with other adults in the community.

Fourth: creating in schools involved in Teacher Corps the conditions enabling teachers to exercise their professional competence.

Fifth: the role of university and school personnel in the operation of Teacher Corps projects. That involves not only university and school personnel, but the relationship of university personnel to the community. The community often distrusts university personnel; the reverse may also be true.

There is the question of the willingness of the university administration to support Teacher Corps and the quality of the personnel assigned to work with the Corps.

Those are the five, and it's proposed that they be substituted, for a period of time, for the original seven categories for small group work.

DR. BUSH: If you break into small groups, you might first spell out issues and problems that need solution in each of the areas, each fundamentally important in moving educational personnel training forward.

Second, try to come up with possible alternative ways to tackle these problems; third, a consideration of ground rules that are needed as you set up projects dealing with the problem areas.

DR. PANKRATZ: Let's consider the givens. Bill Smith thinks that we're going to have 40 projects, which limits the amount of dollars per project. We must keep legislation in mind.

DR. OLSON: It's redundant to think about things that the law doesn't allow.

DR. BILL SMITH: Teacher Corps should capitalize on what's coming down the pike--low income, teacher education--even if other programs are able to deal with it, it gives us something to negotiate, linkages that we hadn't thought about before. Think about curriculum development in its broadest context when you talk about elementary and secondary.

So, though we focus on Teacher Corps, let's be sure to deal with broad-based issues as well.

If you're going to have legitimate involvement in the three components, you've got to do something about the funding for community. Title 1 has "community education" and a percentage of money set aside for teacher training.

Your design may not be something we can deal with immediately. But it may be something the Office can deal with in the immediate future.

As we look at the five issues, project and program design could be incorporated in the analysis of each of the category areas, so we could incorporate the two immediately.

MR. WOOD: Teacher Corps requires community involvement.

If it is going to be a vehicle for finding out more about the effects of community involvement, we should stress community involvement, so Teacher Corps can respond and gather information about it. Perhaps through demonstration of a variety of approaches, some of which may work, and some which may not work. It might be valuable to demonstrate both to the educational community.

MS. MENZEL: About school conditions that enable teachers to work more productively, I suggest that category four is the place for the role of school administrators, their exclusion from planning and their resistance to the program.

DR. BUSH: Category four is environment, and administrators are right in the center of that, I would agree.

DR. GITTELL: What can we consider about recruitment and selection within a given group? Training in classroom operations, yes, but there isn't a great deal to be said about the real question of recruitment and selection.

DR. PANKRATZ: Have we included in recruitment and selection the kinds of school systems, the kinds of universities, as well as the actual personnel? In other words, where are we going, and will schools that really need help get projects, demonstration sites, large universities or small universities?

MR. WOOD: That's a big issue.

DR. PANKRATZ: It's the whole thing, but we have a lot to deal with.

DR. BUSH: Recruitment and selection of personnel on-site, has now been added.

DR. PANKRATZ: That answers the whole question of placement. Teacher Corps might test the assumption that there are service skills that teachers learn which can be applied to settings other than schools.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: One point: we're all assuming that school and family are entirely responsible for the socialization of the children.

Now, what relationships should be developed for youth and children in the adult society; not just in school, not just in the home, but in the adult society itself?

The youth of this country is in exactly the same predicament as the retirees: they are the beneficiaries of society without any responsibilities, without any chance to assume responsibility.

DR. BUSH: Do we add a sixth category, children and youth in an adult society?

DR. OLSON: This relates to my question of yesterday; the extent to which Teacher Corps sees itself as an agency implementing broad Federal policy.

MS. MAHONEY: Teacher Corps has supported projects to test whether teachers can be trained as advocates, functioning differently from classroom instructional people. So this is an area for Teacher Corps to explore and consider.

DR. BUSH: I hear support for adding the sixth area.

MS. GERALD: I hope that though we add that area, you include the child in every category.

DR. PROVUS: This area is different from others. I favor making that value explicit in the sixth area.

DR. GARTNER: There are explicit value assumptions in each. I think you could take all. Number one has a value assumption that relates to diversity. Number two has a value assumption in terms of competency in a broader sense. Number three has a value assumption in terms of involving the community in the substance of the program. Number four has a value assumption--in saying that teachers aren't unable to behave appropriately...

MS. DELANO: I'm glad to have the sixth one. The children are the focus for everything.

DR. BUSH: Let me just go through them so the numbers are correct.

Now, number one is recruitment, placement and selection of personnel for project sites; number two, training for classroom operations; number three, training for community operations, understandings and skills; number four, conditions necessary for the exercise of competence namely: the environment; number five, the relationship of school, university and community; number six, involving children and youth in adult society.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the Plenary Conference were recessed.)

DR. BUSH: We want critical thoughts on these reports.

Paul Collins will speak on Topic 1: recruitment, placement and selection of personnel insite.

MR. COLLINS: We thought our issue was the establishment of funding criteria, and of the underlying assumptions on which notions of criteria are based. The assumption is the demonstration of susceptibility to change by a given universe of proposing agencies consonant with Teacher Corps objectives.

Subcategories of criteria could be: this universe would have the long-term plan; a management system based on a needs assessment; systemic linkages including existing (or in potential) governance structure.

Universe readiness as regards internal support systems would mean capability to mount a high quality operation. This operation would be staffed with personnel, both administrative and substantive in both the permanent system and the temporary system.

And, lastly, as regards to sites, it must have a capability to generalize findings and experiences to a specified and analoguous educational setting.

The opportunity will exist for acquisition of educational personnel forces enabling the community to fulfill its desires for its children.

Training designs will be based on specific educational settings and include (1) needs assessment, (2) reform plan, (3) training and retraining designs which would include the following: educational personnel job descriptions, a diagnostic system, organized experiences and validated certification, or recertification consonant with EEOC guidelines. All of the above would be subject to a prefunding decision and Teacher Corps verification process.

DR. BUSH: Our next report will be by Bruce Joyce.

DR. JOYCE: Start on the chart at the left. We treated the area as skill training and feel that the value and valuing processes should never be divorced from skill training.

Skill training should take place inside that philosophical assumption. Therefore, the trainee's self-perception should be embedded and become part of the skill training process.

It's important to expand his awareness of self while undertaking the skill training, as its objective is not simply to impart skills that teach people how to acquire skills.

So, self-training ability is an important goal. David Wickens suggested that the teacher should be taught throughout skill training to be a data collector about his own behavior, able increasingly to understand who he is, what he is, what he is like as a skill performer.

It is probably not possible to teach a teacher within a two-year period to be a self-contained classroom teacher accomplishing the fullest role. And two issues arise: one, do we build differentiated staffing possibilities and change school organization in order to make skill training feasible; and two, in order to provide the kinds of settings in which skills can be exercised. Do we train people for certain roles and then add other parts of the role, or is all that dealt with in the context of putting it together. But there is often a serious lag between the role of training and skills to theory production.

The theory in teacher training is often divorced from skill training. We see skill training as an extention of theory--a person in the classroom is acting as a philosophical person. This raises an issue, should people be exposed to skills that represent more than one educational philosophy? If so, to how many do you expose him?

If there are competing theories in an area, do you teach in the skills of one, or two or three? How do you handle that?

Next chart, third row; the question of real world complexity, not only for practice for the role, but in terms of training. The skill training that occurs in the classroom is subject to its booming confusion.

It's very difficult in a classroom to focus on particular skills. So we ask whether a combination of laboratory settings and field settings has to be put together so the teacher can practice skills in a relatively protected setting as well as in the real world, where he has to synthesize his skills into a clinically meaningful unit.

It raises the question of integration between preservice and inservice education and skill training as having possible advantages and disadvantages.

Now it would be very sound if the pre- and inservice teachers worked together to acquire skills, but there are liabilities.

The fourth chart raised questions about what kinds of training are appropriate for what kinds of skills. On the side of the chart we have four kinds of training--one is teaching oneself. A person can teach himself a lot of skills. The question is, what type of program, and what kinds of support are needed? How much help does he need from people around him to help him test reality? Does he need feedback? What kinds of skills does he need demonstration for? For what kinds does he need instructional systems? What kinds of skills are best learned through apprenticeship? Plans for management, for example, may be something he can teach himself, or maybe it's better through apprenticeship. We ought to sort this out--the liabilities and advantages of apprenticeship.

What skills require direct-focus skill training, either software based or otherwise? Which are best learned through focused, systematic training, not through apprenticeship or self-teaching?

And you can go on, and build modules for all sorts of training: best learned through apprenticeship, best learned through an instructional system, et cetera.

Now, the last two charts have to do with some important assumptions. First, skill training viewed in terms of Teacher Corps has to take into account that programs vary vastly. You cannot build one linear instructional system for training teachers and see it as suitable for all of Teacher Corps.

Teacher Corps should build alternatives: one is staff development, as many Teacher Corps staff need help in learning how to be more effective skill trainers.

Second, build a software base that can support training in varieties of settings. Third, provide technical assistance for the implementation of a broad range of efforts.

We need two kinds of capability. One is open-option capability, where Teacher Corps projects can select from the staff development, software, and other options. The second might be thrust-related; teaching people how to operate, using management systems, to monitor instruction and programs, and monitor programs.

Examples of thrust-related programs include teacher centers. If Teacher Corps goes into inservice training heavily, it would need heavy staff development, heavy development of software capability, and technical assistance to get the thing going. Few projects can do this by themselves; many will need support.

A synthesis of projects and people ought to be conducted to identify critical need areas. Many projects would like a national effort and staff development of the team leaders. Almost every program starts with massively needed training. And a lot of training options could be identified. Areas of greatest need and types of vital support ought to be identified. The national skill training support system could focus on these areas, and develop through syntheses by expert project developers.

DR. BUSH: Thank you very much. Now, let's have the report on community involvement.

DR. PROVOS: A basic problem is lack of meaningful community involvement in Federal programs: no real equity; no real decision making authority in planning and implementing Federal programs. The community has failed to benefit from Federal programs; it has not met basic needs, not broadened its experience, not received training, and has not obtained expertise.

One solution: the community must be involved in every aspect of Federal programs. A genuine tri-part governance in the case of Teacher Corps must be established and documented before any program is funded.

Ways to assure equal community participation are: (1) the community must conduct its own needs assessments; (2) the processes that have been used to involve the community must be documented in any proposal; (3) the characteristics of the community participants must be described in detail in the proposal; (4) the community must be involved in determining project goals and objectives; (5) the community must be involved in designing the program; (6) the community must be involved in evaluating the program; (7) the community must be involved in implementing the program; and, finally, (8) how community sources, parents and others, will be used in the program must be spelled out in detail.

To implement this we suggest: (1) planning grants be authorized for projects where funds are essential to secure a community determined needs assessment as part of a formal proposal; (2) institutions of higher education, LEA, or other organizations be required to provide technical assistance to the community to help carry out the needs assessment studies; (3) community trainers be part of each program designed, that is, training individuals involved in the Teacher Corps program in role competence and, (4) individuals be trained as group decision-makers in the project.

We believe that in Teacher Corps everyone should have training for role competence and training for decisionmaking through the group they represent.

Wherever possible, community-based institutions of higher education--sensitive to community needs--should be used.

Finally, Teacher Corps projects should use local training institutions sensitive to the needs of the community.

DR. BUSH: Thank you. Sid, you're next.

DR. MORRISON: Our group was concerned with creating conditions within the schools to enable teachers to exercise their competence. We took two school situations--Minneapolis and New York--where change stresses humanizing schools and focusing on how schools meet children where they are and contribute to the total development of themselves as active agents in their own learning.

Both our schools have concentrated on building communities, within the school, and with the surrounding environment, giving real decisionmaking roles to parents and staff, in curriculum and staff selection relating to, and in cooperation with inservice and preservice institutions such as universities, teacher centers, and Teacher Corps.

The problems and issues which move parents and school personnel to work cooperatively to effect changes in the schools include these major areas of restriction: (1) restraint on staff development, lack of free time for teachers and other personnel for planning, recording, exploring new areas of interest, and developing their styles of teaching.

(2) Lack of use of the community in the education of its children, lack of contact for children in the community through which to develop responsibility and participation, and to provide new thrust for curriculum, and failure to take advantage of cultural differences.

(3) Difficulty for administrators to keep in touch with large school developments. This results in dehumanization and difficulty in building a school into a learning, sharing community.

(4) Lack of freedom to choose personnel on the part of parents, staff, community and administrators--certification requirements make selection or retention of competent personnel difficult.

(5) Restrictions on use of budget for supplies, curriculum development materials, et cetera.

(6) Poverty of the school environment.

(7) Constraints on what to teach and when to teach it, plus concentration on teaching as transferral of knowledge rather than development of children's thinking. This inhibits the interpretation of curriculum as an organized yet supportive growth--stemming from children's interests and uniqueness as they interact with responsible adults in a sensitive learning environment.

(8) Isolation and segmentizing of components within the curriculum, preventing children's integration of skills and subsequent growth.

(9) Failure of means in a community to alert the community for the need for change in a way to get involved in change. This failure comes from the devastating effect of traditional exclusion of parents from schools, degrading treatment of children via records, suspensions, et cetera. Also, lack of meaningful parent-teacher relationships, and the force of ancient fears and hostility, and lack of knowledge of child development and human learning on the part of adults working with children.

(10) Problem of keeping able teachers in teaching, rather than losing them to administration or other fields.

Ideas for Teacher Corps funding support:

(1) University-school-community center in which time is allowed for school staff to develop curriculum and materials for self-development of skills. In these centers, university faculty and students would be involved with school staff in learning experiences, using community resources and community members.

(2) Development projects which can be helped to develop further training components.

(3) Release of any member of the school staff, administrator, parent, teacher or support of community members to serve on center staff, or in Teacher Corps team.

(4) Community-based projects which relate to schools and develop new ways of using community institutions and new ways to train school staff.

(5) Flexible roles for team leaders and interns; intern service with children, so interns can test their abilities and confidence.

(6) Team leaders in large schools who are developing smaller communities as a means to decentralize the schools and create humanized learning environments for children, staff, and parents. Advisory councils would be part of this plan.

(7) Older students helping younger students--in schools and at the centers.

(8) Development of working relationships with other university departments, not just education--this might be done through the centers.

DR. BUSH: Thank you. Bunnie Smith?

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: We tried to answer two questions: how to get the college, the public schools, the community committed so that at the end of a five-year period there will be structure to carry on the work after the money ceased.

The second: how to get the community, the public school personnel, the university personnel to work together in the development of other programs.

Other issues include: development of a structure to make a real difference in the total college program, so that Teacher Corps would not simply be tacked on to the existing program, but would be a modification of the program. Where to begin? Develop new structures within the community, perhaps initiated and developed by the public school with the help of the community and the university; or a structure provided by the State, or by the community itself.

We have no brief for any of these but note that some States have developed systems Teacher Corps might tie into. They have through legislation, for example, laid down CBTE or PBTE programs. Community participation exists in Florida. The Legislature has set up and funds Teacher Centers all over the State and has established by legal mandate advisory councils for every school in the State.

We have to bear in mind that in many universities, reward is tied to research and publication, much more than to teaching or teacher training. Often it is left to junior staff or student assistants.

What sort of reward system is required for continuance of Teacher Corps work after the five-year period? Teacher Corps could develop its own reward system; central office suggestions as to types of rewards might be built into project specifications or guidelines.

Now, community-school-university personnel: how can they understand each other, learn about each other's work, get and share knowledge. How can you get these three working together? One way is to share responsibilities, have public school people work within the university, have people in the community develop relationships with the university, or the university involve itself in the schools or in the community. Pension systems, fringe benefits, and salaries do pose problems, however.

Parity is also a problem unless there is some degree of economic underwriting of that parity. If university people work and are paid and community people work--leave home and hire a baby-sitter--and they are not paid, parity becomes a real problem.

How do you eliminate individuals not performing adequately in the program? Who is responsible? Nobody in the program is neutral. They have a community, university or public school interest.

When the three parties develop a program, how do they handle the "givens" in a situation? The university has regulations, the schools have regulations, people in the community have commitments. We suggest the university provide an experimental program in its plan so that Teacher Corps would not have to go through the regular routine of getting approval, at least in the initial stages.

Two other issues: from whom does the inservice person get rewards for his training? If Teacher Corps goes into inservice work, and the individual is trained, what does he get? A certificate? An improvement in salary? Some other position?

Distinctions exist between a person's career development and his inservice preparation for the purpose of satisfying the deficiencies of an educational program. In the latter, considerations of promotion and pay differ from career advancement situations.

What sort of evidence can the three entities agree to accept as assurance that their concerns were being met? This overlaps with national program criteria for judging program suitability and success.

DR. BUSH: Thank you very much.

DR. BARRY: The sixth group is concerned with value judgments that should be made about Teacher Corps programs.

Because it is important that this group influence the others, we cite for each of the five other groups a connection between them and our seven issues.

Our basic assumption that even though the client (as described by the Teacher Corps legislation) is the intern, the aim of training is to prepare child advocates; personnel committed to improving learning environments so children and youth develop to their fullest potential. Such advocates must know how to interact with other human service professionals so as to have more impact on the improvement of learning.

The seven issues are: (1) How should Teacher Corps implement social trends expressed in such legislation as the Civil Rights Act of 1964; State legislation for the right to an education, or "mainstreaming for the handicapped?"

(2) How can Teacher Corps broaden its base to include people who deal with other learning environments--corrections, mental health, social welfare--and still get support from Congress?

(3) How can Teacher Corps train school personnel to recognize the realities of our current culture that demand the redefinition of schooling?

(4) What strategies for change must be employed to create collaborative relationships in human service delivery systems?

At the university level, we include as partners the professional schools, the arts and sciences, recreation, home economics, health--in which Teacher Corps would be the link between education and other faculties involved in the politics of change.

(5) To what extent can Teacher Corps strategy be instrumental for institutional change outside the education establishment?

(6) How can Teacher Corps get tuned into the dialogues of other agencies such as the media to provide better services for human development at all age levels?

(7) How can Teacher Corps develop a continuing dialogue with people in other human services groups concerned with present and future child and human development?

Can Teacher Corps, as a political as well as a training force, have more impact on the future by collaborating with the aforementioned people than by focusing on reforms in schooling alone?

Those are the seven issues. For Group One, as a tie-in, we suggest that in site selections the Centers include the opportunity for interns to participate within the whole range of delivery services. The factors outlined above may be used as criteria for site selection. As for teacher placement, Teacher Corps graduates should be employed in settings other than the school.

Group Two--the knowledge and skills involved in child advocacy will include these areas of concentration in the training:
(1) Understanding of self in relation to human groups.

(2) Understanding how people learn, and the skills that support the processes.

(3) How to bring about change without losing your job or compromising your principles.

(4) The teacher is a student of his profession, learning to use the conceptual tools of analysis for research and inquiry.

For Group Three--expanding the role of community education in Teacher Corps beyond governance questions to activities such as the presence of a teacher in a courtroom to act as advocate for a child; with this as a part of the community experience in training.

Group Four--the problems of creating conditions in which professional competence can be exercised.

All new approaches fail unless the school is open to working with the agencies of the community.

Group Five: There is enough emphasis on involving other professional colleges at the university--as we do with the arts and sciences--because improving human services is what it is all about.

DR. BUSH: Thank you very much. We have 30 minutes or so to react. Who would like to start?

MR. WALKER: I wasn't clear about child advocacy.

DR. CORRIGAN: We're talking about protecting the rights of the children, their rights to an education.

MR. ROYSTER: You also said schools should make use of the community agency services. If the school is going to play the role that you just said, why utilize other agency services?

DR. CORRIGAN: It doesn't take over the role: it doesn't become the correction agency, the mental health institution, the youth club, and it doesn't become the YMCA. You go to court in the role of helper.

MR. ROYSTER: But the teacher would go to the court and serve as an advocate for the child in a judicial process...

MS. MAHONEY: Teacher Corps' Fordham project is training secondary teachers as advocates. The project is testing whether or not it makes sense to train teachers differently, with a different sensitivity, to understand the problems of the school delinquency population while they complete their two-year training--that is the intention. Serving in a guidance capacity, they also actually function as advocates. The experience helps interns to fulfill community commitments.

Though trained more broadly than usual secondary teachers, when certified as teachers, they go back into classrooms with this kind of specialized experience.

MR. ROYSTER: I didn't understand the discussion on Group One relating to recruitment of teacher candidates.

MR. SNEDCOF: I didn't either.

DR. OLSON: That's what I suspected.

DR. BUSH: Do you want to try to explain yourselves, Group One?

DR. OLSON: The notion is that education personnel are essentially facilitators whose mission is to permit adults, or adults and children working together, to assist children to achieve adult competence in a community. We develop a notion with respect to what the schools need to be able to do to accomplish that mission. On the basis of that, we develop reform plans with respect to the different kinds of education personnel may be needed in the system. We then develop job descriptions. From that, we develop a training and retraining scheme which includes a series of steps that are increasingly going to be mandated by the courts. After we have adequate job descriptions, we can construct either test criteria, criteria-referenced validation, or other sources of validation of job skills which can be used. On the basis of the job descriptions which emerged from the reform plan, we develop a diagnostic system to determine whether a person has the personality, skills, knowledge, etc., or whether he doesn't

Having done that, we organize experiences for the personnel in the system to assist them to meet those job descriptions. If they can't presently meet them, then we develop an operation to recruit to the system the personnel who can perform the job.

We have a validation procedure to determine whether untrained people can, in fact, perform the job.

One other thing that needs to be said there by way of clarification is that, in each of these steps, what we're talking about is not only of concern to the Teacher Corps; we're talking about the permanent system in which the Teacher Corps system is set. The long-range change-plan, management system, and the several relationships with the community should be part of the total institutional system.

DR. BUSH: Any further clarification questions on Group One?

MR. ENOS: Is that to the extent that characteristics such as race, sex, or whatever are relevant to the design, then those folks would be recruited?

DR. GARTNER: Well, the assumption is, I think, that the LEA "center for educating teachers" site would be located in the poverty district fundamentally. If you have cultural based education, part of the needs assessment would be to set a job description and charterization rooted in the cultures. People either have to have the skills and conditions useful to that culture or they would have to pick them up very quickly.

DR. OLSON: If you want me to add culture specific criteria, fine.

DR. GARTNER: Okay.

DR. OLSON: If you asked, how could we bring our children to adult competence in this society, in this community, that would be the fundamental question that the community asked. It would ask it working with the other technical assistant agents.

DR. BUSH: Okay.

DR. GITTELL: I want to ask a question about another panel.

DR. BUSH: Fine. There are clarification questions on any panel.

DR. GITTELL: I have none in this one.

MR. ROYSTER: Paul's answer to me sort of related to recruitment and placement. Those questions may relate more to selecting new people to potentially become teachers. I don't see any tie-in there as to how his explanation would relate to selection of schools that are already fully stafred. Let's use an example. A school has all white teachers, and 25 percent black, 25 percent students that are Puerto Rican, and so forth. How do you deal with that in selection of a school to be in a program?

DR. OLSON: Okay. They don't have any black teachers. They are teaching black kids. They don't have a management system for accomplishing putting black teachers before black kids. I don't think they ought to be considered.

MR. ROYSTER: Long-term plan. Okay.

DR. BUSH: All right. Any more on Group One? Let's go to Group Two. How do you want to phrase your question?

DR. GITTELL: I really don't understand very much about Bruce Joyce's presentation at all.

DR. BUSH: Okay. Could you give them a couple, three examples that would explicate your problem?

DR. GITTELL: I can't remember what the subject was, as a matter of fact.

DR. BUSH: The subject was the training of teachers and other educational personnel for specific classroom operations, or as they relabelled it, "what kind of skill training would be most appropriate, and how do you get it in place?" Okay?

DR. JOYCE: I'm a little lost and don't know how to begin.

DR. BUSH: Maybe one of your colleagues would like to try it.

DR. PANKRATZ: I can't put it any clearer unless you go over it again. I thought at first it was a good job from what we had done. If you pick out a certain part, look at the paper and want to know what that is, that's a different thing, because--you know--maybe we shouldn't put the paper out.

Any particular part of it, I think you would have to identify. I think what we are suffering from is remembering after all the speeches, what we said. I think that's a problem.

DR. JOYCE: Our assumption is that there will be a great deal of staff development and a great deal of technical assistance.

DR. GITTELL: You haven't said what those are going to consist in.

DR. JOYCE: People who might be knowledgeable might be brought in to do staff development.

DR. GITTELL: You mean a sense of how this...*

DR. JOYCE: Teacher Corps could develop an institution's capability to offer options; staff development could offer support technical assistance to the program through a technical assistance cafeteria. A few years ago, they picked up the minicourses which a lot of programs were trying to use, catalogued them and made them available to all Teacher Corps projects to increase the software they could use inside a program in a skills instruction system. They got a lot of minicourses. They provided technical assistance with the catalogue. Our assumption is there probably will be very few thrusts that would hit every program but there might be a number that would hit a lot of programs.

To identify these, one ought to talk to program directors, all the constituencies concerned with teacher training, design experts, and other types of schools.

MR. WICKENS: By a "census," do you mean "a survey of present factors?"

DR. JOYCE: Yes, and present expression. The Teacher Corps team leader is a good example. The Teacher Corps director and team leaders both agree that they need a lot of training but no one has ever exactly pinned down what that ought to be.

MR. WOOD: Is there some way that this can be inductive to a greater extent, generate from identified people that are identified by the community, colleges or schools.

DR. JOYCE: Well, I think, I would imagine it depends on how you carried it out, but I don't think it would be productive, say, to do a census of all populations now, or constituent population with respect to say, what teaching skills they ought to be given as a priority. But as programs develop a shape and are attempting to produce competency, then the designs ought to give you a basis for finding out where the most needs are.

---

* The conversation between Dr. Gittell and Dr. Bill Smith is missing. Dr. Gittell has submitted a summary of this conversation, which will be found on page 121.

MR. WOOD: This is still in the way of clarification. This is somewhat similar to your comment yesterday that there are some things that are so expensive that they have to be done so that you can save capital and serve the largest population.

DR. JOYCE: Yes. And some areas where the pure technical capability does exist inside the local project. Let me give you a case in point for clarification. The Teacher Corps material on supervision is good but there's no system inside of Teacher Corps to disseminate that from one project to another.

Now, Paul Collins, here through scavenging and what have you, contracting with a system to take those supervisory schedules and make them available to all projects, helps everyone.

MR. WOOD: I think I would be interested in hearing what the principals' attitudes are: what the utility is of things that are generated elsewhere has been because they may be useful.

DR. BUSH: Okay. We'll get into that issue. Are there any more clarification questions?

MR. ENOS: Yes. I would like to go back to this one statement, the "valuing process should not be divorced from skill training." Can you further expand on that one?

DR. JOYCE: We felt that one shouldn't just teach skills; teaching is a value statement. You're living a philosophy. So a skill training which is fragmentary and isolated creates certain kinds of educational environments, making a difference to life in certain directions.

We were objecting to fragmentary work in which the whole goal is not clear. We were saying rather that in the course of acquiring skills, people ought to be looking at the general nature of teaching, the nature of teaching styles, the nature of children, the nature of objectives--while getting them together. Trainees often didn't see the training as requiring skills in self perception, or requiring a value system. At the same time, the program probably shouldn't leave people just where they are, you use skill training to expand people's total awareness. It may be that you have to require the skills teaching philosophy but you don't end with skills alone.

DR. BUSH: I have the feeling that we're slipping over into discussion of issues and attitudes and points of views very quickly.

DR. OLSON: We've only done two of the presentations and questions about the other one.

MR. WOOD: I would like to ask Glen and Sid their reaction; how have they generated materials for their schools? Do you have some center or some place, or some centers that you could call upon to create materials as long as they could be used fairly generally? Would that be useful? What kind of network do you need to connect yourself to those centers?

MR. ENOS: Well, we use some really diverse kinds of materials. Some are produced commercially; the Moffatt series in English for instance. Very few of them are packaged. Few packed things are O.K. We are developing our own courses because of that. We don't have, on a national scale, any retrievable system. We tend, I think, to reinvent the wheel many times over. Very few commercially produced programs seem to fit our own programs. I would really enjoy seeing the things and materials that are evidently being produced in other areas. We have no vehicle.

MR. WOOD: Did you have an access to the teacher center at the University of Minnesota? Do they have materials that are useful in your school?

MR. ENOS: That teacher center has not, at this point, developed to that.

MS. MAHONEY: Are you talking about materials that are being used for instruction for children? Are you talking about training materials for the staff?

MR. ENOS: We have really developed neither--we have developed our own.

MR. WOOD: You feel that's been inefficient--the way you've had to do it?

MR. ENOS: Yes.

MR. WOOD: You would enjoy having 1 or 2 or 3 resource centers some place that you could go to and--

MR. ENOS: Fortunately, we've had conferences that have helped us to share, like the Rockefeller Brothers Fund has provided.

MR. WOOD: Paul.

DR. OLSON: I was concerned with perspective in Bruce Joyce's remarks: as I understood it, there was an emphasis on development of software and hardware, and perhaps dissemination systems, which it is very hard to reconcile with the community-specific work that we are talking about.

I've never known of a situation where a community was asked to assist in developing the specifications for software in an instructional system. The way the communities are kept out is that they are allowed to describe very broad goals but the technical details of systems are reserved to the professionals in national hardware and software systems--they elaborate the instructional designs without giving any attention to the specifics that the teachers have to operate with.

DR. BUSH: I heard the Provus committee saying that was for the birds.

DR. OLSON: I did too--I don't know how the Teacher Corps is going to get the community to draw up descriptions for the kinds of national software products that will also be community specific.

DR. BILL SMITH: I'm not sure that I'm convinced that's the function of the community. If you have people who have technical competency, if the input to that technical competency team is provided and gives them a sense of culture, makes sure they as technicians have all of the things that are necessary, why do you need the community to do it? What is wrong with the technician?

That's my problem. Help me understand it because it seems to me that if that is what you are saying then maybe what we ought to be asking is what is wrong with those technicians.

If you are saying a group of folks from the community are going to put the school together and run it, then that's not what I'm talking about as public education. I don't know, but I've got problems with it.

DR. OLSON: We thought you might.

DR. BILL SMITH: Well, help me then.

DR. BUSH: Could you explain it a little more to us?

DR. OLSON: There are members of our committee who want to try.

DR. BILL SMITH: All right.

DR. BARRY: First of all, everybody is using the word "technical" so it has caused a problem. There is no technical competency that anyone is putting down on the table--so-called professional technical competence. It seems to me "technical competence" would be so established and that we could validate it.

I've seen operations where community residents have invested in their children and put something out on the table programmatically. There is knowledge which says "This is the best way to go about doing this job, we've proven it." There may be several options. A program like Teacher Corps should look into the possibility that there are many options.

DR. BILL SMITH: When Paul Olson said that he saw no evidence that those who make the determinations have the technical skills to do that, the question I want to ask is: how far are you going with the notion of options? Are you talking about community notions that didn't get filled out by professionals, or are you talking about the people who fill out a plan and then ask somebody else to orchestrate it?

Where I'm having the problem is at what point the professional comes in.

MR. ENOS: Don't you have to, at each point, ask the question, "What entitles you to be a decision-maker at that point?" We have some kind of consensus as to the notion that lay people have the right under law to make the broadest policy decision about education.

DR. BILL SMITH: Yes.

DR. GARTNER: The other matter is deciding what's going to be done on the third Monday in Sep[illegible]ber in the third grade in the arithmetic class, okay?

Who should make that decision about what's to be taught--how it's to be presented, and so forth? If you can prove that Mrs. Smith, teacher, or professor John Quinn has some basis to say that rather than Mrs. Garcia Perez, then obviously the former group of people ought to make that decision.

The question that I think is, "What is the demonstrable differential capability which entitles one set of people to make the decisions and implement them as opposed to another set of people? Is there something that we really can say is professional expertise, and is it not just a series of protections of professional tradition? And that's a technical question."

MR. WOOD: You're suggesting that Teacher Corps might be testing where the division comes?

DR. GARTNER: It would be exciting--the question comes, "What's the demonstrable skill of some surgeon that leads us to be confident he'll do a good surgery rather than you or me?" The doctors would like us to say that they should make the decision on the health policy questions so that we will not. We end up spending money on the kinds of things that they have capabilities of dealing with--not preventive health protection. We don't deal with Board of Health issues, not medically. Medicine doesn't have capabilities in dealing with health issues. Instead of a health system, there is a medical system and the medical system really is a disease care system. That's what the professionals have the competency to deal with. The same sets of issues, you know, are appropriate in the education field.

It would be interesting to see if the Teacher Corps could be a vehicle to test, at which point, what kind of competence possessed by which kind of people would help. One of the most appropriate jobs of teachers is to help kids.

MR. WOOD: Right.

DR. BILL SMITH: I'm not convinced testing that notion is a function of Teacher Corps. I think it's a function of the National Institute of Education. I think we're slipping into an assumption that we can inquire into everything. I don't think we can.

We may be able to test some notions that are based on some data. I'm not so sure we're clear as to what is testable in our kind of program. I had hoped you would go a step further and walk me through an analogy of education that allowed me to feel comfortable with Marilyn's attack.

I would like to have some sense of one specific example of education that is appropriate. I would agree with you on the issue of health policy that there should be some other people making some decisions. My concern is whether or not that doctor is responsible for doing the surgery or giving you the pills, and whether a committee decided that he ought to give green pills or red pills, or whether he decided that.

And if he did, don't we have some point in the business of education where somebody makes the judgment that a designated person (the professional) can give the green or red pills. Now, if it were decided that the person can give the pills, but we haven't decided which pill to give, then as a person in the community I could understand that.

But if you're going to tell me that the community must decide which of the two pills to give, then I've got to ask the question, "What kind of system do we have?"

It's a little extreme for me. I need to get some sense of it and that's the reason why I wanted to be sure I understood the discussions.

MR. WOOD: Okay. I hear Al saying that perhaps education is sort of teaching up the same as the doctors.

DR. BILL SMITH: I'm sorry. You tell me that we've got to deal with the real world. I've got problems understanding what it is we're talking about yet. It's just not clear.

MR. WOOD: Well, it's a variety of educational decisions which are really the important ones because administration can frustrate policy in many ways. And the clients of the schools in turn get frustrated because they don't feel that they really are involved in the schools. Is it important, number one?

DR. BILL SMITH: I thought we were far beyond the question of involvement and input. I thought we were talking about the question of whether or not the decision as to what is done and how it is implemented on a day-to-day basis becomes a function of that group of people that you're talking about.

DR. OLSON: I started this.

DR. BILL SMITH: Okay.

DR. OLSON: The context was in connection with the pieces of software and hardware; let me give you a specific example. Dick Lid has been working with Bunnie Smith with respect to how to give a lecture on literature. It's on how to give a lecture and how to ask questions on certain literature. The materials are protocol material. I don't think that set of materials would be created now--not certainly for many specific communities. The protocols are protocols only for some audiences. The materials, say, work for certain communities, perhaps. The words which are used are predominately from certain ethics of groups; the question technique used, I am certain, would be inappropriate in certain cultural contexts. I think that design specifications on software are expected to be transportable. The special assumption tends to be that all kids are like all other kids in all other communities. I regard that as a hazard.

DR. PANKRATZ: You can go back in the history of Teacher Corps interns and talk to them. All we were saying was let's sort out the different options that you ought to have. Where assistance can be given that ought to be done.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: The question of what materials are usable under what circumstances is an empirical question. From an armchair I can't do anything other than make guesses about whether it will be satisfactory or not satisfactory.

The question of costs is something about which I think we're beginning to learn. I just want to speak about it a moment.

From the studies about learning from observation, it's becoming clear that many things can be learned about teaching (I'm talking now about skills) through films that are fairly inexpensive to produce.

Let me illustrate what I mean. Walter Borg, Utah State, has worked out a set of films based on Kounin's research on classroom management. He has found that he can get changes in teacher behavior by the production of films that show contrasting ways of behavior in the classroom. He's testing now to find out whether or not the change in the teacher's behavior actually makes a difference in the number of disruptions in the class.

You can produce those films with very much less money, if you have to, than a mini-course. Another thing, these things are apparently successful only in cases where the elements of that behavior are already in the record for the individual.

DR. PROVUS: The most powerful organization in American education today is categorically opposed to any programatic attempt on the part of the government to test ways to get greater participation of the community in the professional decisionmaking process, by entering the process, or stressing the many options developed in other places.

DR. CORRIGAN: Because you have creative ideas doesn't mean anybody has to use them. If they don't find anything useful, they are going to reject it all. The most important knowledge we need to develop through Teacher Corps and other university programs is the knowledge to use knowledge.

DR. BUSH: Suppose, Bill, you wrested a few more million dollars from the Treasury to improve education and schools and teachers. Is it better for the next five years to spend it developing more powerful competence on the part of teachers, or to find more ways to get the community to say what should be done, and how it should be done, and how it should be evaluated? Where is the most critical lack in moving the enterprise forward?

DR. GILLIN: Either/or isn't really the problem?

DR. GARTNER: The question one might ask is, "If you are concerned with the learning of children, what variety of persons needed to make that happen, do which pieces of it best?" We probably want to involve as many players as possible at points along the axis.

I am not so sure about our evaluation capability, about which pieces where can be best done by whom. We decide automatically that professionals do something best, and lay people do other things best, without much basis for saying that.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: In a broader context, what we are trying to do is to reverse the process of specialization or professionalization of society. That is really what is behind the whole discussion.

DR. BUSH: Is that setting the clock back or forward?

DR. JOYCE: Can you say that again?

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: I say the total focal question in this whole issue is to be understood in the context of an increasing specialization and professionalization of society.

We look at cooking, for example, as an art. It is being professionalized. It won't be very long before cooking will just be a hobby. You buy your food practically ready to serve nowadays. Every activity in our society is moving toward specialization or professionalization.

MS. GERALD: A comment on specialization--I took my son to the hospital once, not because I had no medical knowledge for a basic emergency, but because I thought the staff had skills that I didn't. And when I got there, the things that they did were no more than what I could do.

But I should have been involved in their treatment process. If they perceived my knowledge as helping them, I would be usefully involved. Now, a classroom teacher should be able to look at children, questioning themselves as to whether there is something helpful they know or can do, and this doesn't exclude other people's input.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: I didn't advocate exclusion. I ask what can the layman do, what can he do with the little turf he can stand on when more and more of it is being claimed by specialization and professionalization?

DR. BUSH: It is five o'clock. We have an uncompleted tack. Do you want to continue our plenary session tomorrow?

DR. WILLIAM SMITH: Now, our critical points are involvement of the community, the dimensions of the community and the question of the competencies and skills of the teacher.

Is the philosophy of the community task force that there is no such thing as competency? Should there be some alternatives? How in fact do you get the skills or the competency? Can our groups tease out the substance, and make sense of these complexities?

Do we understand the underlying assumptions? Is what is presented in such conflict with other thinking that we have a dual system? Can we then talk about it as being integrated so people can go back and give more substance to it?

DR. PROVUS: Bunnie Smith's concern is what ideas we can give Teacher Corps staff by the end of the conference.

MR. WOOD: Our organization into subgroups is immensely helpful, as we continue in guideline development.

It seems now--and I have suggested to Bob--that a couple of other things would be useful. And I am not saying when these should start--tomorrow morning, tomorrow afternoon, or when.

I hope we will be able to put ourselves into two or three subgroups and say, "Okay, we are now applicants. We are from the rural area; from a city area; from some other type of area..." and then we visualize a specific Teacher Corps project.

We need support, we'll crank in evaluation, dissemination at the beginning... and work out our examples.

DR. PROVUS: You would like to have a couple of models.

MR. WOOD: Right. Now, on the question of professionalism, Teacher Corps can offer three varieties of response to these pragmatic situations.

Models would be fine, leaving us with a recommendation for a process extending over at least the next nine months and maybe the next year--a starting point to develop sophisticated output for the 1976 programs.

DR. BILL SMITH: I am not as much in need of models of rural or urban projects as I am for detail in the issue of the community dimension. I need it to formulate policy and design.

DR. PROVUS: It would be very useful to have those models.

DR. BILL SMITH: I don't want to get caught in trying to come up with a specific model or set of recommendations when it may be better to dwell on pieces that we should clarify--a foundation upon which to structure models.

DR. PROVUS: Models are not essential for functional committees, or a written report. We just want something to continue to work from.

DR. BARRY: Have we exhausted the possibility of refining what we began in these groups?

DR. BUSH: Yes.

MS. DELANO: Our group really has the beginnings of a quite well-integrated model. Because we work primarily with young children, it is easy to draw community people into work with the teachers, opening new worlds for children.

MR. WOOD: I see models as a pragmatic way to examine Teacher Corps projects, the effects of conditions and possible outputs.

So, I suggest we continue.

DR. BILL SMITH: Then go back to our small groups?

MR. WOOD: Maybe two or three groups can develop complete models.

DR. OLSON: Not specific urban or rural models, but a generic model. How specific do we want to be?

MR. WOOD: I was just suggesting a number of models of project design because you might get different types of things out of each model that haven't come out so far.

DR. BUSH: We have had very little on evaluation or documentation--an extremely important part of the new Teacher Corps, and almost nothing on dissemination.

DR. OLSON: If you have a valid diagnostic process and validation process, you get evaluation and documentation then.

This question of relationship between the community and professionals may be a thing which is settled in a whole variety of arenas, and not within Teacher Corps.

I just want to give three illustrations. In the Ritalin controversy, professional teachers, nurses and doctors worked together to administer doses in Omaha, Gallup, New Mexico, and in a variety of schools. They were apparently following a set of Food and Drug Administration guidelines. It was only through the intervention of Ernie Chambers and Ted Johnson in Omaha, who were community representatives who happened by accident to get in touch with the right person in the Food and Drug Administration, that the whole thing came to a head. This seemed like the dryest kind of physiological process. Ritalin will have X, Y, or Z effects on children. And yet, by virtue of a kind of "conspiracy" among professionals in the medical industry and in the education industry, the consumer was being denied access to information on the possible harmful effects of the process on children.

And you may remember that there was a Congressional investigation and another initiated by the Office of Child Development after the Gallagher hearings which set very strict guidelines with respect to what professionals could do. This was eventually settled in Federal guidelines.

The second illustration has to do with what has happened in some community endeavors. I am thinking of Harlem Prep, the Nation of Islam--some schools which have not been staffed by professionals in contexts, where professionals have operated for a long time, and things weren't going so well. Schools were staffed by "non-professionals." By some accounts the Harlem Prep and Islam schools went fairly well.

I think such experiences have some effect on people's sense of how much professionals know and how much they don't know. The experiences disturb the public image of the professional.

A third thing that disturbs the public image of the professionals is what has been happening in the courts. The National Teacher Examination was developed by professionals. Supposedly it described the training that professionals receive in conventional colleges of educations. And it has been declared an inappropriate instrument by the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals in Nancemond. The Mercado case declared the professional training and examination processes of the Board of Examiners in New York to be inappropriate and illegal.

These things have begun to circumscribe the deference the public will give to professional competence.

We ought to admit those constraints as part of our discussion and then go from there.

DR. BILL SMITH: All these judgments are made by professionals. The courts are professionals--it is a conflict between professionals.

DR. CORRIGAN: Some community people are professionals, not education professionals but extremely skilled people.

DR. PANKRATZ: In the not too distant future, you are going to have a lot of guidelines. Will developing models help you enough? These models have to give you substance by which you can issue guidelines that will allow or encourage the variety of things that you want; and also give you criteria to judge whether a proposal is good and meets guidelines--pretty definite criteria.

If I am a client who wants to look at the RFP and I want to know how much latitude you give me to be creative, and how much I have got to fit the line--will I be helped?

DR. BILL SMITH: The models wouldn't help me, simply because I am more interested in the collective wisdom of this group as it relates to the incorporation of communities; felt needs in the overall policy design for the program.

I would prefer to have that sense of it. I would prefer confrontation to sensitize us to teachers; I prefer having an underlying rationale to a worry. I hope we'll have a report for Teacher Corps saying, "Here are our outcomes." Are we in a position to go to the next step?

DR. PROVUS: I think there is a unity here. And the notion of generic models is helpful: we are currently engaged in a discussion of value questions.

Now, hopefully, we will be able to hammer out some models based on the resolution of those issues, which then can take rather concrete forms of relative specificity, depending on what Teacher Corps wants to do with them.

It makes eminent sense to wrestle with value questions, come up with the models of teacher training, models of teacher behavior, and models of teacher strategy, and models of Teacher Corps programs--and I think that is what is meant by models here.

And if we can give you some pieces or entities that represent something like those types of models, hopefully, they will be useful to Teacher Corps.

MR. WOOD: If we get our models together, how will the new Teacher Corps be different from the old Teacher Corps? Will it reflect what we have known from experience we have gathered from other teacher development programs that we have had over the past years?

DR. BUSH: Oh, we could say that it has been better in the ways that it has been good, and it will get rid of its problems and difficulties...

MR. WOOD: But that isn't sufficient.

MR. MORRISON: Contrary to the notion that schools cannot be run except with professionals, in our own district of 25 schools, every school was open and run by parents and teachers together, not in opposition.

In our own school, people handled the physical problems of building maintenance, classroom problems, curriculum, how to handle difficult children--all kinds of policy questions. There were regular meetings of parents and teachers, a model of what is possible, and which serves as a basis for things we've institutionalized right now.

There is not just a place, but an absolute need for this kind of coalition to improve the quality of education. Kids don't belong to the professionals, we don't always know what's best for them.

There has to be humility in coming together to decide together what is best.

DR. BUSH: Sorry, but I have to adjourn the meeting. And we will meet at 9:00 in the morning to hear a proposal on how to proceed tomorrow.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above plenary session were recessed.)

The following paper was submitted by Dr. Marilyn Gittell to provide the substance of a discussion that was omitted. Please refer to page 105 above.

The 1960's contributed a new emphasis to the concept of citizen participation. OEO programs originally conceived the process or participation as advisory and peripheral to decisionmaking. Experience in these programs, however, convinced the participants that without power in policymaking they were performing a ritual. Many of the social engineers who conceived the programs, which were to serve the cause of social and institutional change, also recognized the need to specify a more direct role for those who were formerly powerless. Those who held power in existing institutions, as might be expected, resisted any participatory role for citizens which would interfere with their power. They used the terminology of participation, but their definition excluded delegation of power. From the perspective of these various interests, the term "citizen or community participation" is subject to different interpretations. It is essential therefore that I establish that for these purposes, community particpation is defined as a direct community involvement in decisionmaking.

The extent and character of citizen participation must be addressed in all aspects of the educational policymaking process, at all levels and in all areas of decisionmaking. No aspect of decisionmaking should be totally isolated from consumer or citizen inputs and accountability. This would include the processes of planning programs and implementation which perhaps traditionally are considered totally "professional" undertaking. Any process which excludes participation of the people who are the recipients of the service and have a direct interest in policy decisions must end up lacking in responsiveness to needs.

Prevailing institutional arrangements emphasize the role of school professionals in policymaking. Professionals control all levels and areas of decisionmaking; they also have major roles in education interest groups. They advise State and local legislatures, and administer educational policy on all levels down to the classroom. They are protective of their power, and defensive of the prerogatives they have established. Too often, this power is used defensively to protect the educational status quo with little regard for standards, outputs, goals, and procedures for accountability. In many ways, they have lost interest in the impact of their policies on the clients they serve and have substituted professional standards and goals in its place. Often the two goals are in conflict. Added to this professional power structure, in more recent years, is the growth of strong teacher organizations. They have become still another component in the professional ranks, with a vested interest which may be in conflict with consumer needs.

It is important to note that effective community participation is a process which requires a clearly developed governance structure. It requires that some functions be allocated at the individual school level, some at the district level, and some at the State level. A balance of citizen and professional decision-making can then be outlined in each circumstance. The governance structure must also insure that the process of educational policy-setting is an ongoing, dynamic process. It must allow for a constantly evolving output from as widespread discussion as can reasonably be achieved, and with as high a degree of sensitivity to differences in needs as is possible.

Community participation, to be effective, must be institutionalized as a continuing process. It must allow for constant feedback and ongoing revision of policy.

TEACHER CORPS PLANNING CONFERENCE

- - -

Round Table
on
Teacher Corps Planning

- - -

Belmont, Maryland

25 July, 1974

CONTENTS

Page

9:00 a.m. Session 123

3:30 p.m. Session 147

PROCEEDINGS

DR. BUSH: Your Steering Committee came up with a very creative suggestion: that we have a case study of an actual Teacher Corps project presented to us--the way a project really operates.

After that we would analyze the report, indicating problems, and how a project might look if it were going to be done under the next step with the new legislation, and proceed from there.

Roger Pankratz can give us a concrete case presentation.

Following, we will form two groups: Bunnie Smith will lead Group A. Paul Olson will lead Group B.

Now, there is an ad hoc group, under John Williamson, to carry through on planning.

MR. ENOS: Planning of what?

DR. BUSH: Do you want to talk about what you had in mind, Russell, when you designated that on the original outline?

MR. WOOD: That's the planning process that will lead to the fiscal year 1976 program, taking the output of this conference and putting it in some more "rational" process.

I don't think many of you know a document called "Windows to the Bureaucracy," issued by the National Advisory Council for Education Professions Development, but they suggested deliberate and public discussion of policy before getting into programs, decisions, alternatives, etc. Teacher Corps does have time for that process for fiscal year 1976.

We have a select ad hoc sub-committee designated. I have recommended the steps in that process and types of people and organizations that might be involved in that. We think that that would be substantially based outside Teacher Corps--with Teacher Corps' cooperation--while Teacher Corps is occupied in administering the new legislation for 1975.

This group is going to recommend a process for planning leading to 1976, starting with the product of this conference.

MR. ENOS: We have to look at a philosophical base which will change education where kids are involved. There are things being done at present without funding, in danger of being lost because we do not have the vehicle for training teachers to put them into practice. I don't mean making technicians out of teachers; I mean developing teachers who can operate within a philosophical base.

Now, we do have NIE experimenting with alternative programs, but the vehicle for making this model viable is outside of those few locations; they are outside of NIE also.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: Can you speak on specific issues?

MR. ENOS: All right. I don't think we have dealt with getting education out of a segmented kind of approach which I would call traditionalism. And I think that takes an entire revamping of a philosophy of education. Community involvement and child advocacy only touch on the issues.

DR. BARRY: Is everything Teacher Corps has done to date inadequate? Are we to wipe the slate clean and start all over again?

MR. ROYSTER: We ought not assume that all Teacher Corps has done is bad and to be done away with. We ought not narrow our thinking to what it has done. We ought to broaden our thinking to new and additional approaches to add to and improve what is already good.

DR. BARRY: Then we must begin with some basic idea of what Teacher Corps is all about. Out of my own experience in Teacher Corps, and other areas of education in the Office of Education where I worked, I think that the structure of Teacher Corps is exemplary. I think the relationship between community, higher education, and the LEA is something to be preserved.

For eight years I worked to develop programs now called open education. There are many structures within the existing Teacher Corps program into which these ideas can be beautifully set.

I would hate to see this group inadvertently destroy some of the basis of Teacher Corps, so give careful thinking and careful value judgments to what we discard and what we build

MR. MORRISON: How do we react to the specific point that teachers need more training in how to deal with learning difficulties?

Child development, specific pedagogical techniques that would assist in this haven't been aired enough.

MS. GERALD: I would agree, but as we said, the structure provides for putting that into programs now operating.

MR. WOOD: This conference maybe should have started with the consideration of child development. Now, we have gotten into some basic issues, particularly in the professionalism-lay interaction discussion yesterday.

Supporting United States policy in terms of court decisions and trying to get people more confident to teach their specific population is pretty basic. But even more basic: what is our understanding of child development, how does Teacher Corps impinge on that, looking at it from the child on up?

DR. JOYCE: The Teacher Corps should be planned by first planning an educational program for children, based on consideration about the nature of the human being, and a valued position in relation to it.

Taken to an extreme, it means an attempt to design an educational point of view, operationalize that, and use Teacher Corps as a vehicle for it--quite a break with the way things have operated, and one which should be made quite consciously.

It seems to me that Teacher Corps has rather had the point of view that there are many ways of looking at the child and his education. And that around those ways many types of people build different kinds of teacher education programs, and support is provided for them. But basic considerations of the nature of the child and how he should be educated are not seen as matters of concern for Teacher Corps, but matters of concern for the people brought together building Teacher Corps projects.

MR. WOOD: I'm suggesting that we explore that dichotomy. And I'm not suggesting that there is a single child-development approach either. There are an array.

DR. JOYCE: There are.

MR. WOOD: Perhaps Teacher Corps' development policy should be grounded in what we know about the development of children.

DR. JOYCE: To build any Teacher Corps project, I would find it necessary to think about the society and its human beings, how they grow, design schools, pick places for education of children; then come the roles of the teachers, the teacher training program to help people acquire what competence and attitude and philosophical capabilities are necessary for those roles. But I would see that as occurring at the project level.

DR. BUSH: But not at the national level.

DR. JOYCE: I have no objection to its being at the national level, but I see it as quite different.

In the one case Teacher Corps provides support for that kind of thinking, and in the other case it tries to engage in--

DR. PROVUS: Your position, I think, is very clear, and a vital one at this conference. You would like to see at least one Teacher Corps model which insures certain conditions for development at the local level. I would think that that could be formulated in one of these groups.

DR. OLSEN: Well, I'm not sure, Bruce, that I agree with you, or that I agree with Mal, if I hear you correctly.

It is incorrect to assume that people will subconsciously build--from a manual or picture--a clear understanding of children's development, or the politics and anthropology of the school in developing a process. I've seen very few that have.

"Windows to the Bureaucracy" is a document with which I have some disagreement. But it is not a bad document. In many places it suggests that the Federal government be very exclusive about the models which it is testing. Differentiate those clearly, examine the implications and consequences of creating separate models.

I think the idea is good. Those models need to have pertinency and careful thought. It would not hurt if the Federal government announced that it expects the project to make clear differentiations and to build from a solid research base, a solid political understanding, a solid understanding of the anthropology of education. I think that we need differentiated models, but not federally-stipulated differentiated models perhaps--as in the old follow through.

DR. PROVUS: Cannot both of these positions--and they are different--prevail at this conference and within the Teacher Corps framework? I, for one, would hope so.

DR. JOYCE: I wasn't meaning to be an advocate. If Teacher Corps were going to attempt to work from a given point of view, or try to hammer one out, that's okay. It ought to be a conscious choice; if that decision is made, I would rather be a member of the group that is trying to build that philosophy.

DR. PROVUS: And you say this should be a conscious position on the part of Teacher Corps management?

MR. WOOD: All Paul is saying is that whatever you define as the philosophical foundation, then the research activities should be made explicit. But you might have a set of those rather than one. And we're taking it as an assumption that we are going for a variety in Teacher Corps.

DR. PANKRATZ: I agree with what Paul is saying, but I think there ought to be some very definite alternative models developed locally, but oriented towards some general philosophy about end products for kids. These alternative models should have some definition in that they can be demonstration projects, which can be looked at as to how viable they are.

I have nine items which are problems for projects through cycle eight. These include input from projects all over the country. They were developed out of the Washington Conference.

It's interesting that all the items and problems of our discussion have come up earlier through Teacher Corps. I have heard very little new in the discussion here that has not taken place elsewhere.

DR. BUSH: In addition to the case study, you have that list of nine problem areas?

DR. PANKRATZ: I'd like to start there and see why some of these things have happened.

DR. BUSH: Okay.

MR. STEFFENSON: A question, I'm not clear as to the function of the planning group.

MR. WOOD: The planning group is going to recommend a process based on "Windows to the Bureaucracy" to take us over the following year to a more sophisticated recommendation for '76.

DR. BUSH: Which you may or may not follow.

MR. ENOS: But we've had no input in the assignments.

MR. STEFFENSON: The group is extremely homogeneous. There is no representation from the community, nothing from the State Department, nothing from the teachers' union, and no ethnic representation. This is why I have some difficulty with using this kind of group to suggest processes for next year.

DR. PROVUS: First, this group would produce only an advisory document.

Second, it would merely outline a set of content-free procedures.

Further, other groups will come in with general ideas or models about what Teacher Corps might look like, and will provide substantive material to be processed during the coming year.

DR. CORRIGAN: And, Jim, you can ask other groups that you are going to meet with in Teacher Corps to do the same thing for you: you could get many different views as input. It's why you have this group here--to get feedback on suggestions that they have.

DR. BUSH: There was a group last month, creating input for your future planning. This group won't offer definitive conclusions to be followed.

MR. WOOD: This group is not set up to reflect various ethnic backgrounds, or various organizations--that is not the purpose of the group.

The purpose is to get ideas to start the planning for Teacher Corps, ideas that might go into the '76 program.

It's our intention to go to these other groups and other organizations and get their input to the process plan John Williamson is responsible for.

John is just charged with coming up with a starting document, that may change substantially when we involve other organizations and the other clientele.

DR. GITTELL: What will Groups A and B do?

DR. OLSON: Look at Roger's presentation.

DR. BUSH: And continue yesterday's discussion about major issues and problems, surface other issues and problems, and then take it on to what it means in terms of advice to Teacher Corps as they project themselves into '75.

[illegible] MORRISON: One outstanding feature missing in a lot of Teacher Corps programs was community, university, and school involvement. Yet, at this planning conference we don't have such representation, with the implication that we are going to be making policy about those groups, without teachers' unions or teacher representation.

MR. WOOD: This is simply a start, one purpose for asking John to report back tomorrow is so we can all know the recommendations for the next step.

DR. STEFFENSEN: We are asking you to reconsider the ad hoc planning group decision.

MR. ROYSTER: It's bad to assume that if you plan from a narrow base everything will be included later, the base is already established.

DR. STEFFENSEN: It has been suggested that Teacher Corps historically has involved a large number of groups; community, teachers, universities. Then we sensed that major planning activities were going to take place by groups which represent none of the three indicated segments of society.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I don't see why any group can't get together and come up with recommendations, sort them out, try them against other groups, get them modified and so forth. Maybe there's more below the surface here--a concern about where Teacher Corps is going, about control.

DR. BILL SMITH: (Entering) Did I miss something?

DR. BUSH: I'll bring you up to date. We made a proposal to have a case study, break into groups, and to appoint an ad hoc planning committee, but we've a strong revolt against that. People don't feel it's the direction to go. Correct?

DR. JOYCE: I wonder how many were satisfied and how many want to debate changes.

MR. WOOD: You have to discriminate two issues here. Whether we're going too fast and have overlooked the basic child development, and are rushing into this program thing. Then the notion of whether "Windows to the Bureaucracy" can be applied, through the select ad hoc committee for recommending a planning process. That's the other issue.

There was discussion on both the Teacher Corps side and people who have come in about the two groups that are going to focus on and critique the eight-cycle project that Roger will present.

The second issue is that Jim has taken specific exception to going ahead with any recommendations on the planning process for the next year, on the basis that this group is not representative ethnically, and not representative of organizations, and so forth, that the Teacher Corps traditionally works with.

So, my sense is that it is the latter issue that we're discussing now.

Is that correct?

DR. BUSH: There's uneasiness on the part of members of the group as to our next step; we're approaching the close of the conference and people are worried about the outcome.

DR. PANKRATZ: The issue has to do with the people here new to Teacher Corps. But that was a planned thing.

They've discussed issues that Teacher Corps people, staff included, have dealt with before: hence we're heard very little new in the last couple of days.

Now a group of people new to Teacher Corps is going to make some recommendations for the next cycle. They might be very good people, but there hasn't been time enough for trust. People here with a lot of faith in the Teacher Corps are not sure that the new people really know the way it ought to go. And with our different groups, we're bound to get some uneasiness.

I'm being candid, not necessarily right.

DR. BILL SMITH: I think you may be right; we may have differing goals we hope to achieve out of the conference.

We're caught between trying to consider issues and trying to operationalize. Hence Russ's comment of yesterday to the small groups that perhaps we would not be able to achieve definitive operational pieces because we dealt with issues that people felt were unresolved and Russ's hope that we could bar issues during the Thursday lock-in and try to work through the process.

But we all start from the same base--the hope of improving the education of kids.

We're trying to jell different perspectives from an operational point of view to think through ideas beneficial to the Teacher Corps. We don't buy in toto a planning process from Roger or from John, without our staff, without additional people, but we hope you'd be a part of planning--helping us to think through step-by-step processing.

We are trying to learn as much as possible from you as to what we ought to be doing as we reexamine the nature of Teacher Corps and consider new options. As far as I'm concerned, I'm totally comfortable whether there is an ad hoc planning group, or three planning groups, who will go off, put together something, bring it back for everybody to respond to--whether it's the process by which we look at the future or the process by which we develop specific operational pieces. We can talk about present and future at the same time and be farther ahead as a conference.

DR. CORRIGAN: I was concerned about Jim's comment because all of a sudden I became something other than a person here to discuss ways we can improve the learning of children through new approaches to training. I became a "representative," because Jim says we can't have planning until we have other "representatives" on the planning.

I'm disturbed that I'm here as a "representative." I came here because Bill asked me: to get my two cents in openly, among other people here to share what they felt.

DR. STEFFENSEN: The issue started with the word "planning." Once we get into planning activity and talk about the future, then roles change. Essentially, we are here to raise and discuss issues. To talk about planning in terms of "Windows of the Bureaucracy," and next year--then we must have appropriate representatives--

DR. CORRIGAN: But there is no answer for planning; it takes all kinds of groups.

DR. PROVUS: We're going around in circles.

MS. GERALD: If this group is to be concerned with opinions outside of government and Teacher Corps, why is someone within government chairman?

MR. WOOD: Not necessarily outside of government, but outside of Teacher Corps. We selected John Williamson because he has related responsibility in NIE.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes, and you know how well NIE has done--

(Laughter.)

DR. JOYCE: Credentials enough!

DR. BILL SMITH: I'm very comfortable: I like conflict; it's the nicest part of the whole shop.

What has happened to us is that Bush has democratized what was a unilateral process, one not built so that everybody understood it. The group is now involved in the democratic process they like and are accustomed to.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Is it the purpose of the conference, however constituted, to help look ahead to planning for FY76? If so, then the issue is how best to do it.

Is your concern that the conference shouldn't come up with recommendations about planning, or that the way the conference is handling planning is inadequate?

DR. BILL SMITH: I think Jim has reflected a staff attitude that has not had a catharsis, but everybody is going to go to work.

It is important to use you all effectively to help us go the next step. If we accept that everybody is ready to roll.

(Coffee break.)

DR. PANKRATZ: I will try to be brief, and also be somewhat general.

I want to start with the nine concerns of a group of select people who had been in Teacher Corps, and who were mostly connected with universities. That's the perspective.

Let me go through them quickly.

Program assumptions: the whole value base that we were talking about, how do you set it up? How do you make it work so that you live by it in your project? That was one problem area.

The second area was integration of teaching skills, both in program synthesis and in the teaching business. How do you get the skills integrated--not fragmented and piecemeal?

Third; we still need to deal with this diagnostic-prescriptive learning behavior problem.

Fourth; staff development, university, school and community, how do you get staff developed retrained to deal with the needs?

Fifth; program evaluation and assessment of competence.

Sixth; collaboration in program development. What is input, decisionmaking, and coordination? Do you deal with coordination? Do you deal with coordination during implementation, monitoring and so on? What is the role of the community in that?

Seventh; strategies and politics in program development and institutional change. What have we learned? What do we need to learn coming into a political situation, to be able to make a change in that institution? We have learned not to come in the CBTE program and change the course numbers. Should the director be a full time faculty member who already has rank and status? Institutional commitments. That related very directly, but they (the university people) thought that was a separate area. And finally there was the development of viable, humanistic, flexible management systems for everything in the project.

Now, this rather small group felt these were their biggies.

As people sat down to write eight cycle proposals, what kinds of things would they put in that proposal because they thought Teacher Corps wanted them? I'm speaking strictly from a director's point of view.

Some very good proposals do get written.

So, here is kind of a format, general yet somewhat specific to our case. First, the needs assessment had to be done at the university, school and community. We went out and we talked to people, not just the steering committee, but individual people, got input, and then tried to put that together.

Next, you have to write objectives. One, two and four-year objectives, putting them in measurable terms, then identifying the strategies for change. In our case, we used the portal school concept. A number of projects have the university-school-community cooperation. That includes shared governance, field centered instruction, competency-based training, an adaptive learning environment, which means schools must break up the traditional curriculum into something that will give kids more options.

That's very general, but if you are going to be in Teacher Corps, you have got to show evidence that you are going to do that in some way, including allowance for dealing with learning behavior problems, community-based education, management and evaluation process--not only for the university, but for the school. This included needs assessment, developing new curricula, et cetera.

Finally, minority leadership was something that our eight-cycle brought in. We extended our program to work with schools that dealt with American Indians.

You have to describe what your program development process is going to be--the training program, not only degree programs--and what happens at each stage. Team leaders, graduate interns, and inservice teachers.

Now, you say we didn't think you were involved with inservice teachers. Well, sometimes you use different methods to achieve your objectives. Inservice training was not in the program. And we also did administrative training but nobody knows about that either. But you have to describe the experiences your interns are going to have in the school which relate to objectives for school development, and experiences in the community that relate to this.

And then you describe the management, evaluation, shared governance, and the end product, saying, "Here is what you can expect for the dollars you are going to give us; here is how we're going to manage it, and here is how we're going to evaluate it."

There was a time when you really had to do it a certain way. Now it is more open, but I'm not sure we've really grabbed hold of that.

Another major proposal element is resources. What kind of recruitment, selection, staff, equipment, materials are you going to need? And finally there is a budget, with a whole section of documentation of commitment and participation.

Now, that is what has to go into the proposal. If you do it well you can easily write 400 pages.

DR. BILL SMITH: A couple of quick questions.

You selected the portal school as your vehicle. What options did you have in terms of the strategies for change that you could have used, as opposed to what you thought we wanted to hear?

DR. PANKRATZ: I don't think Teacher Corps has ever imposed anything on me that I couldn't buy. There were things they called my attention to, but I said, "Yes, that's really all right."

I might develop variations; I really wouldn't give up any of those emphases. I never felt that Teacher Corps would be restrictive--I wouldn't believe that.

Budget wise and programmatically, they were always very flexible.

DR. CORRIGAN: Once you got the grant.

DR. BILL SMITH: Well, how can you be inflexible before you get the grant, Dean?

DR. CORRIGAN: Well, that's what I mean. He had to meet certain criteria--your guidelines. Still, he did include experienced teacher training and administrative training anyway.

DR. BILL SMITH: Yes, but by the eight-cycle it was encouraged. Unofficially.

DR. GILLIN: In fact, they wouldn't have funded him if he hadn't had it in.

DR. CORRIGAN: You've got to have it in.

DR. BILL SMITH: We've had it in for the last two years. Now, it will be an integral part.

MS. DELANO: May I ask about the objectives in measurable terms?

DR. PANKRATZ: Every Fall we had a plan in process for developing an adaptive learning environment, or the school or college had a new program. The task force developed the outlines with participant involvement. There was an operating, shared governance body and so on.

MS. DELANO: Can applicants get outside help on this, as part of the plan; or is that something that will be possible under the new situation?

DR. BILL SMITH: What do you mean by outside help?

MS. DELANO: Outside help. I assume that if you are working in terms of looking at your goals, it is very good to have someone from the outside working with you on it and working at your project as your project develops, rather than waiting until it is over.

DR. BILL SMITH: From our staff?

MS DELANO: Yes.

DR. BILL SMITH: No.

MS. DELANO: Or not from your staff.

DR. BILL SMITH: If you are writing the proposal, any cost is yours not ours. If you compete, and you succeed, then you have options within that to do additional things.

MS. DELANO: I can see places where people might have problems. I would always want an outside evaluator who understood what we were trying to do, worked with us consistently, talking with us, giving us thoughts on how teachers will react to what we were doing.

DR. BILL SMITH: We will probably be moving to the notion that applicants have independent outside education auditors or appraisers--from the project's inception.

DR. PANKRATZ: We developed a discrepancy evaluation plan where we simply checked the benchmarked things.

DR. BARRY: Speaking of child development, when you say adaptive learning, are you talking about what Frazier has discussed, adaptive in contrast to selective?

DR. PANKRATZ: "Adaptive" is a very broad term and some schools created many courses for kids. Most of them elementary. The project is secondary now. We're talking about more learning options, different alternatives, etc.

This is an outline of what a two-year project looks like. As for recruitment and selection, usually funding is so late that you don't have much time. Actually, last year, I recruited illegally with monies I didn't yet have. Washington didn't know.

DR. BILL SMITH: But after you knew you had a grant?

DR. PANKRATZ: No.

DR. BILL SMITH: Risky!

DR. PANKRATZ: But a friend in a regional office said: "Get ready." This problem has got to be gotten rid of...

DR. OLSON: It does disturb me that many times Roger has said, "This is not allowed by the guidelines, but we got away with it."

Now, that often happens in projects, but in differential ways. The director can get away with some things that community planners can't get away with. They do not have the same access to differentiated signals which say, "We can't say that officially, but unofficially we can."

It's important that we create out of the central Teacher Corps office some system of developing a parity communication system among the groups.

DR. PANKRATZ: But the community proposes a project they want to operate, and Washington says you can only have so many dollars, and we advised them, "Write a good case and send it back in anyhow." We got away with some of this in the community component.

DR. OLSON: But you make the choice of whether they do because communication flows through you.

DR. PANKRATZ: Yes.

MS. GERALD: When Roger "got away with it," it doesn't mean something was illegal. Teacher Corps and grant people were aware of it.

MR. ROYSTER: Paul didn't indicate that something illegal was going on: he pointed out that information that allowed Roger to take certain steps accessible to Roger but not to the community.

DR. PANKRATZ: To move on: recruitment and selection varies, depending on how much funding you get. You go national, local, or both. Recruitment centers actually help you recruit locally.

You allow one week for staff training; then you only have two weeks for team leader training. I've heard complaints that this is too short. You can't train team leaders; you've got to find them. And there is no time to train them because you're "fixing the bike while riding."

At preservice interns come in and orientation and personnel needs must be dealt with. If you can get by that you are quite lucky.

Then, after from three to six weeks, there is team assignment of interns with an attempt for some initial cohesiveness. Interns then go out to live in the community because they are going to start inservice training.

A number of things can happen, depending upon orientation and integration. Team leader training continues, and you can bring in other people from the school. We try to involve the principals. We did the second time around.

The team may be a threat going into a school. You have a team leader who--if selected from that school--meets with the team clandestinely. But last year he was teaching like anybody else. That provides inherent problems. What happens depends upon the person the team leader is.

If this group can integrate with the faculty, fine; you can work things out. If not, real cleavage will follow.

Often, quite early, intern idealism is shattered. School is not what they thought it might be; nor do they have as much control as they thought they would have.

I'm overdramatizing, but this is a problem. You start into inservice: you really don't have the skills. Teachers often say, "If you think you can teach so well, teach."

They put interns in the classroom and let them flop and say, "See, I told you so."

So, you have frustration; you want to change things, but how? Interns are expected to spend 60 percent of their time in school experiences, 20 percent in the community, and 20 percent working on a master's or bachelor's program. That's a general guideline.

DR. BUSH: Can you describe the community experience?

DR. PANKRATZ: The community activity was varied, depending on each local group.

One group started two pre-schools that are continuing after Teacher Corps. Getting parents and kids involved in community schools was a big thing.

We had surveys about, "What do you want for your kids?" and how you can integrate that into the needs assessment process. Also, there were individual projects.

MR. MORRISON: That's the way it worked out with the advisory council?

DR. PANKRATZ: Yes. It took two years to really get that advisory council working.

DR. JOYCE: The range of that goes all the way from nothing but talk about community to things like the Hartford Program, where they actually ran alternative schools within the project setting.

DR. CORRIGAN: Did your time allow you to get your community involved in an actual selection of interns for the schools?

DR. PANKRATZ: We demanded it, and the second time around, we screened people we felt could make it in our graduate program. The school and the community picked the people--we demanded consensus. A year later they say, "Intern X isn't working out," I reply: "They are not my interns. They are your interns. What are you going to do about it?"

DR. CORRIGAN: You were fortunate to get your community advisory board within the time frame.

DR. PANKRATZ: First time around it was minimal; the second time we were already in operation, so--

DR. CORRIGAN: So, the new time schedule may correct "first time" problems.

DR. BARRY: Didn't you have a selection committee or a steering committee?

It is awfully important to use them.

DR. PANKRATZ: We had a selection committee.

You also had people starting volunteer programs. Money was set aside where interns could actually write a grant for community programs and run them on their own.

We had an intervening summer; people had to be brought back to campus to take required courses.

It was difficult but in many cases community work continued through the summer. Some expanded.

Then you move into inservice the second year, where we used to have a lot of effort towards team teaching. By now the radicalism of interns has worn off a bit...

I'm overdramatizing, but during the second year you have a different, more subtle crew. Between inservice one and two you may hit the right mix.

More things move the second year, interns are less discontented.

That's the two-year timeline in very general terms.

Now, let us look at the major areas. Projects are very comprehensive in general. The director is responsible for management, budget, communications and seeing that the staff gets together.

Then there is the program development area; development of new materials, identification of materials, work with the faculty involving institutional projects and staff training.

Also, there is training--with delivery to the field--a whole new ball game. Field training is not the same as on-campus training; and you have intern training, inservice training, and administrative training.

Then there is portal school development; a consortium of university, community, and the schools working together, and you provide some technical assistance for that. You've got to deal with needs assessments, new programs in the school and inservice training needs that result from that. You deal with the school management goals agreed on by the group.

MR. WOOD: Roger, is that one school, or all the schools that Teacher Corps was in?

DR. PANKRATZ: We had six schools to work with, all designated as portal schools: two will continue as good centers; two are marginal; and two drop-outs. Half to a third will end up, five years down the way, as operating portal schools.

The school coordinator worked on problems with teachers and principals and handled the day-to-day involvement of the students and interns. He was a very helpful troubleshooter--school person, hired by the school. He worked closely with the principal.

The community coordinator plus one or more additional persons coordinated the community activities and got needs assessment and feedback, and assisted in the volunteer program, et cetera.

This outlines a Teacher Corps project: the total operation. You are trying to change institutions, with involvement across the board. We required every school to have a set of one-year, two-year, and four-year objectives.

One thing about shared governance. We backed off because we just weren't getting participation.

Now we divided resource people from the role groups and said that shared governance is to get the resource controllers to be responsive to the various role groups.

So, superintendents, deans; liberal arts, fine arts and graduate school representatives; the director of Teacher Corps, and someone from the State Department are one body. Principals, as representatives for parents, interns, students, team leaders, and also site representatives making up the master steering committee. No decision could be made without consulting them.

These latter, realizing they had power, came to meetings, and dealt with the vice president, the superintendent, and so on.

DR. PROVUS: Was the university the recipient of the grant?

DR. PANKRATZ: Yes. They got inservice training money. The school paid intern stipends, but legal, fiscal and programmatic control of the project rested with the director.

DR. OLSON: Who is responsible for a breach of contract? Is there accountability?

DR. PANKRATZ: Each school district received money to pay interns and travel. They put in 10 percent.

The university got all training monies.

DR. OLSON: So the university had the responsibility?

DR. PANKRATZ: Yes. The university grant paid the director and the school grant paid the school coordinator.

An intern council dealt with intern training and evaluation; six interns, one team leader, and one site coordinator--a staff person, whom we considered a go-between. We also had a local steering committee which sent their representative to this group and dealt with the local program. Some school arrangements differed from others.

DR. BUSH: What group made and approved the budgets?

DR. PANKRATZ: Budgets and program were approved by both groups.

DR. BUSH: Where did budgets originate?

DR. PANKRATZ: Our process was programmatic; we got input from various people, groups got together, and people wrote down items.

Some ideas were rejected by various groups.

DR. JOYCE: Is much of the budget actually debatable outside the guidelines? There are fixed items.

DR. PANKRATZ: With certain types of training, there isn't flexibility, there isn't money for much equipment. Some materials, but not a lot.

Now, in Kansas, if Teacher Corps pulled out tomorrow, what would be the residue? A number of new programs in a college of education; competency based programs (not narrowly defined); field training centers, both Teacher Corps and non-Teacher Corps; training centers where all who go through teacher education get field-based training; new field master's degree programs; new curriculum in schools; more humane teachers; new approaches; Indian teachers in Indian schools--for the first time; shared governance and community schools that will continue to function.

Of course, people could sit in, join the seminar, participate in things without additional cost to Teacher Corps or the university. Instead of having six in a seminar, you may end up with 20. Minicourses from the Far West Laboratory were used. Packaged programs were also used with administrators.

DR. PROVUS: What were your criteria for that?

DR. PANKRATZ: New curricula, options based on what kids wanted to study, the kinds of human relations skills we worked on in dealing with students in non-authoritarian ways.

MS. MAHONEY: Can you document what was different about teachers who graduated from Teacher Corps?

DR. PANKRATZ: They were people prepared to learn a lot more about kids. We had testimony from kids.

One other thing, I could never do much without the skills and involvement that I learned in that program. It is a training ground for leaders; I couldn't function in my new job without having had that experience.

MR. WOOD: Is there any systematic way--an evaluation or documentation--to show what works and what doesn't work? Any systematic way to disseminate benefits throughout the school system?

DR. PANKRATZ: The new master's program will go statewide--but there is no systematic program for dissemination.

DR. OLSON: Would you speak about the model of human learning which you began with?

DR. PANKRATZ: I can try! The model was that kids should be problem solvers, able to understand environments, control their environments. People in general should have skills to be problem solvers, the idea of the basic control of one's environment.

We were trying very hard to get participation, movement from nonparticipation to participation. That means more options; being able to choose how they want to learn; community consensus; sitting and working together, people with power who are able to give up some of that power...

DR. BUSH: Thank you; I found this illuminating, a concrete picture of issues and how to attack them. So I want to express my appreciation very much.

Dick Graham has joined us. He needs no introduction. He can help our groups fit the pieces together. There are several tasks.

The consideration of major issues--community involvement, parity, and so forth; identify problems like time-frames; then think about plans for our next steps, to solve problems and move us forward.

Now, on to our small group meetings.

(Whereupon, the proceedings in the above plenary session were recessed.)

Afternoon Plenary Session

Additional participants joined the conference for the plenary session that convened at 3:30 P.M. Because of an oversight, this plenary session was not recorded.

The session included a report by Paul Olson, chairman of Group B. It also included broad and general discussions involving guests who attended only this session of the conference.

Several people who were active participants were invited to submit statements for inclusion in the conference summary report.

The following pages include statements which were submitted by Dick Graham and Lillian Weber. Paul Olson's report for Group B is also included.

GROUP B: Report - Dr. Paul A. Olson, Chairman.

I. Contracts. The review of Roger Pankratz' description of the Kansas University Teacher Corps Project suggests the necessity of preferring contracts over grants in the 'translation' of Federal money. Contracts should require a specific commitment to institutional change by an institution in a form which would allow litigation to hold the institute accountable. The contract ought to show how the temporary system would be phased into the permanent system and how the States can pick up on Federal funds when the Federal developmental grant is completed. This argument is made in Birk and Kerste, Pino, etc.

The committee was also concerned that the guidelines and contracts be developed so that community participants have at least as full access to money discussions, guidelines, and decisionmaking as so-called professional participants. They must have a full understanding of their legal rights, the procedures for budget making, the guidelines, sign-off and sign-on rights. It was proposed that a system be developed for "future services contracting" or "subcontracting" to nonprofit parent or community corporations which would allow them to be a contracting party in the Teacher Corps structure. It is very difficult to speak of them as having any meaningful parity if they are not also a contracting party.

The "B" committee was interested in developing a parity "partnership" between the local education agency and the institution of higher education as both relate to the community in the training of teachers. It was interested in an "obligatory" partnership between the institution of higher education and the local education agency. A new contracting arrangement which provided for very clear "mutual undertaking" to the Federal government by the LEA, the IHE, and the parents (rather than for one or the other having primary responsibility) ought to be explored.

II. Community Processes: The "B" committee wanted to be clear with respect to which processes the community was to participate in: the certification process, the budget making process, the organization of project process, and the training process. It was not clear in the Kansas project whether the community determined the ends and the staff provided the means, or whether the staff and community were constantly working together to develop both means and ends.

III. Evaluation. The "B" committee was interested in the development of evaluations which were formative and nonjudgmental, not simply summative and judgmental. We were interested that the documentation process going on within the project would allow the project to reshape itself across the years and institutionalize "what it had going" which it saw to be particularly applicable to the permanent system surrounding the project. The process of institutionalization ought to be considered in formative evaluation.

IV: The School. The fourth concern was for the kind of school that was used as a training site. It was not clear that the selection of schools was based on an analysis of the extent to which the schools developed within themselves a community which was organic into the kind of community surrounding the schools. Does the school use the same kind of authority structure as the surrounding neighborhood? Does it speak the same language? Does it communicate the same scientific (ethnoscientific) and political skills? Are the skills communicated to those that are sought by the parents of the community as they plan for their own and the area's future?

V. Time Lines. A concern of the "B" committee was that the very precise time line, for the developing of the "skills" and "behaviors" both of the children and trainees of the project, suggests that human learning is a kind of mechanical or assembly line operation. It may take long stretches of experience for a system of structures to be internalized or to be evoked. Later in discussion, Lillian Weber pointed out that children hear language for a year, year and a half, or two years before they begin to speak or form sentences. When they do begin to form sentences, they form highly complex structures very quickly. Language-learning research does not support a strict "timeline" methodology.

VI. Theory. We were concerned that the future project should include a carefully articulated theoretical base, a definition of what the staff thought the teaching art in the specific context of the project to be, how they understand children to learn, what they understand the function of education, of formal and informal education, to be in project context, and what they expect the intervention created by the Teacher Corps project to produce. (With respect to the general growth of children and teachers, we were concerned that the production of excellence in education not be production of excellence which didn't go with anything else. The project proposal should include an analysis of misfittages between education and other structures. At a very low level this could be such a thing as a Teacher Corps "teacher education common school" which had nothing but an academic track educating Indian Reservation students who do not go on to college and are unable to get jobs because they have none of the vocational training needed. Teacher Corps teachers have occasionally been educated in such contexts. Other sorts of misfittages might have to do with peer group organization, use of language, kinesic systems, relationship between work and study, and so forth.)

In setting down the picture of what children are, how they learn, how far education can function in the context, it was felt that fairly explicit postulate statements ought to be made, and care ought to be taken that the evaluation procedure be based on the same postulates as the project, so that the evaluation would indeed come up with fairly precise findings with respect to whether the postulates on which the project was mounted were or were not likely to be fairly sound postulates.

VII. Hierarchy. A seventh concern is with the stipulation in the Teacher Corps guidelines and the Pankratz model, of the master teacher-intern relationship and a set of other prescribed hierarchies. This suggests Teacher Corps believes education to be necessarily performed best, and most effectively, in fairly structured hierarchical communities. While such a belief may be valid in some communities, it may not be valid in others. The "useful" Teacher Corps authority system may also depend on the format of the school, how the school does education, what the other decisionmaking and management structures are within the school and how these decisionmaking or management structures fit with the goals of education in the community--not only its formal curriculum but its informal curriculum. At no point should education pit children against their parents.

Some recollections of the discussion at the July 1974 Teacher Corps meeting. (Paper submitted by Lillian Weber.)

The afternoon discussion--at the point where I joined it--centered on reports from the small group discussions of the morning. The most interesting report, to me, was Paul Olson's, stressing the supports for human development in the culture and in the community. No attempts to improve education could ignore these. No education that set the child against the parents or that created barriers between the child and the culture of his parents could be sound.

There was some recapitulation of the reasons for the Teacher Corps commitment to competency-based education, and a plea as Teacher Corps formulated new goals for this new stage in its development for the recognition of the worth of these old goals. I questioned this holding on to old formulations which, it seemed to me, had in so many instances focused teachers' attention on segments of their job separated from the context necessary for coherence and understanding. Very often the sense of this kind of segmentalized approach seemed to be an assumption that intelligence could not be expected. There seemed to be an assumption that we knew nothing and that understanding of children and understanding of context could not be expected, and so one might as well concentrate on small skills.

I pointed to instances where teachers' time under the aegis of CBTE was so taken up with checking off their performance of small competencies that no time for their integration of their understanding was left. But competence is evidenced as a result of intelligent response and intelligent interaction and intelligent adaptation to the demands of the classroom. And the demands of the classroom are set by children--so the observation of children is first requisite for competence.

The competent teacher assumes that children, although individually different, do learn, do develop, do grow, and sets conditions of learning that further support learning. The basic condition is that the teacher be responsive interactive adaptive to the children.

In answer to the question, "What do we know about conditions of learning, and what do we know about competence in that context " the competent teacher responds that there is much we do not know, and much more that we need to know. The teacher points out, however, that we do know a great deal about the conditions of learning and invokes the overwhelming evidence of ordinary experience. In the face of this overwhelming evidence, is anyone willing to surround the child with silence? The child's obvious need for language surround is established. Is anyone willing to remove from the child's grasp opportunities for interaction with the outer world and with people in the outer world? Such opportunities for interaction are accepted as conditions for learning. And this, too, is established. Is anyone willing, as an experiment, to enforce passivity on the small child? Again the answer is obvious. These conditions--a rich language and environmental surround, people, and a chance for active interaction with the surround and with the people--are what we have tried to develop in open education. The teacher's competence in providing these can be observed, even evaluated. And the validity of these conditions has been accepted as basic for human development by quite a few generations of parents.

These, as I remember them, were the substance of the remarks that I felt were important at that session.

The following statement was submitted by Richard A. Graham.

This will be the briefest of replies to your request for a summary of what I said at the recent conference.

The gist of it was that the Teacher Corps should perform as special world somewhere between that of the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education. Much of what the Teacher Corps attempted in the earlier days was to pick up on the products of the regional laboratories and the Research and Development Centers and the other innovations produced through the support of the Bureau of Research and through other government agencies - NIMH, the Office of Child Development, the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped, the National Science Foundation, etc., and to carry these products into a field development phase. You will recall that this was the origin of our activities in connection with competency-based teacher education and with the concept of the portal school, more particularly that of the multi-unit school and its curriculum emphasis on individually-guided education.

The second proposed recommendation had to do with the role that the Teacher Corps could have performed in defining the competencies required of personnel working in the field of career education, more particularly that of experience-based career education. It was my impression from our site review of the existing career education programs that they were indeed doing some extraordinary things but that these were relatively ill-defined, particularly as to measurement of changes in the participating students. Similarly, the competencies of teachers and other personnel serving in these programs was ill-defined.

It was my thought that the Teacher Corps could, through experimental programs worked out with NIE, undertake to help define these roles and the programs of teacher preparation, both preservice and inservice, that would provide the preparation needed. It was further my impression that what was occurring in these programs could be defined in terms of the development in the various strands of logical reasoning, social perspective, moral judgment and ego development. It was also my impression that the types of experiences could be defined that would produce the greatest results and, in turn, the competencies of personnel and the training programs to produce them could also be well defined.

All this is a very short summary of what was said and what I'd like to say if the Teacher Corps would elect to consider these suggestions.

TEACHER CORPS PLANNING CONFERENCE

- x -

Round Table

on

Teacher Corps Planning

- - -

Belmont, Maryland

26 July, 1974

CONTENTS

Page

10:00 a.m. Session 155

Adjournment 172

PROCEEDINGS

DR. BUSH: This is the final plenary session, and we have three final reports to hear. Dr. Bunnie Smith, ready?

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: These are four explicit recommendations to the Teacher Corps administration.

Recommendation A has to do with the base line for planning the teacher education program. A range of school restructuring, beginning with the conventional elementary or secondary school and departing as far from the conventional as can be theoretically justified, can be considered as a base line for the planning of demonstration teacher training programs at the project level. That means a range of possible educational designs.

A-2, the particular restructuring proposed in a project must be formulated jointly by the school personnel, IHE personnel and a duly constituted body (we avoided "community") of parents and other laymen.

A-3, the restructed school plan must have broad parental support, and evidence of this support must be provided. We did not say "university" or "IHE personnel" support and school support, because we assume that nothing would be done unless that support is there, whereas the other--the contrary may not be the case.

A-4, the restructuring must be justified in terms of theoretical and emporical knowledge, presented systematically and to the point. Opposing arguments and evidence must also be presented and examined and weighed.

The design should be supported on the basis of theory and fact. And we mean by "to the point" that a document of 400 or 500 pages for a proposal is ridiculous... We don't know that much.

A-5, the program of teacher training must be based upon the knowledge and skill requirements of the restructured school and these must be set forth, at least hypothetically in the proposal.

A-6, a plan for determining that the trainee has attained a specified level of achievement in the knowledge and skills must be in the proposal. Along with this plan should be a plan for determining the side effects of the training program on the trainee, school personnel, parents and university personnel.

A-7, a plan for assessing the training program in terms of pupil achievement, conduct and so forth, by reference to a specified criterion level, should be provided.

A-8, the project proposal must also contain a plan for training the people who are going to do the training, and this plan must be justified by theoretical and empirical evidence systematically laid out. Where empirical evidence for particular skills is not available, it should be justified by reference to the wisdom of the profession, and subject to testing as hypothesis.

That's recommendation A, to do with overall program development.

Recommendation B: A program for placing and supporting the trainees and for following them up should be provided by the national Teacher Corps office. This does not pertain to a particular project; it is a national program of assessment. This program should provide for determining the degree of maladjustment in conventional schools, the amount of change trainees are able to make in the schools when they are placed, the degree of mobility among them, the proportion that leave the profession after training and during the training period, and their expressed reasons, and so on.

That would be a maximal level of operation.

Recommendation C: A comprehensive support service plan should be worked out by the Teacher Corps administration; the plan should be made known at the time proposals are being asked for, and the proposals must show the sorts of use they plan to make of such services.

C-2, the plan should provide for assistance in problems of identifying and remedying process deficiencies, problems of training, internal testing of outcomes, and so forth.

C-3, the plan should be based on clusters of projects, either similar as to type, or as to geographic proximity, or both.

Recommendation D: Each proposal should contain a full report on needs assessment, backed up by data and theory. And these assessments should not consist of the pooled judgments of teachers, parents, and university personnel, made in terms of comparing their school against an ideal one.

Rather, it should be based upon empirical evidence as to the deficiencies in pupil outcomes, parental satisfaction, present state of teacher knowledge and skill, and the like.

Such needs assessment should be part of the justification for any departure from the conventional school. In other words, if they are going to depart from the conventional school as a base of their operation, then they should be able to show on the basis of needs assessment that the present arrangements cannot or do not promise to satisfy, and that the restructuring proposed would meet these needs.

Bruce has a continuing report on the kinds of systems that the projects would need.

DR. JOYCE: You'll recall earlier recommendations that the planning team plan a schooling operation as well as a teacher training program. And that's part of the context for this. The issue is what kinds of national staff training programs should be mounted.

The staff responsible for skill training needs training itself, especially team leaders, cooperating teachers, and the university faculty involved in skill training needs to learn a variety of things--how to analyze teaching and provide feedback to trainees, how to train with microteaching, et cetera.

Basic skills for trainees' trainers should be identified, with wide participation in that identification process, and a national program established to help the project staff to acquire these skills. We mean a continuous staff development program, not an occasional workshop.

Second, the design team needs assistance in developing good plans for schools and the training program. We are not sure whether or how this can be done. Issues include: should the planning groups be exposed to alternative plans for schooling and training to stretch their imaginations and provide them with concrete examples of alternatives? Should technical assistance be provided to design teams? Should systematic variation be sought in Teacher Corps designs and technical assistance provided to achieve that? That concludes the report.

MR. ARDIKE: Regarding a needs assessment to demonstrate why the present structure is not serving needs; how about having possible design teams to come in and show different ways of going about it?

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: They would have to hypothesize the design, it might come along in the first year of planning and negotiation.

MR. ENOS: The community has been assessed, has developed a plan based on a suitable philosophical base, has gone through two or three years of experience and refinement; that school could also be a training ground for interns.

DR. JOYCE: A good issue. People would be caught in various stages of maturity.

MR. ENOS: Which means building some flexibility into the design to fit the local situation.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: No premium should be placed on the departure from conventional systems.

If a project proposal reckons to work in a conventional school without restructuring, judge it on its merits, and without prejudice because it's conventional.

DR. BILL SMITH: Do you mean that no premium should be given for moving away from the conventional?

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: No premium should be given either way.

MR. ENOS: In some cases a needs assessment has been taken, and alternative schools have gone through evaluation and reform, and staff development.

Why should those schools not become training grounds just because they were not starting at point zero? They are at a point where Teacher Corps might design a training program which would fit into the school.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: Then, what they have is conventional. They start where they are.

DR. BILL SMITH: You have to base the use of that conventional institution on grounds other than for the retraining of that existing staff, since they have already undergone that process. You'd be talking more about utilization of that facility for new people coming in.

MR. ENOS: My concern is that an open school might move into a new locality without the same process taking place, and teachers might be trained as technicians without a philosophical base. But if that school had money for that development, it might be used as a training ground for inner city teachers who will use that same basis. The local school has always had the commitment to move in that direction, but they don't know how.

MS. MENZEL: There's always the possibility of training staff in better utilization of the existing setup, which has often been structured on a philosophy that was never fully realized.

MR. COLLINS: If a project universe setting, which had gone through a needs assessment and had begun to restructure schooling and training with specifics respective of that universe, would like to move out into different locales, would it be necessary to go through the same process in the new locale? If we had made that assessment and begun operations and reached a degree of maturity, could we not transfer that to the new locale?

MR. ENOS: Our school board has decided to go to alternatives throughout the system, and in localities based on desegregation, they have gone through assessments, have a working group of parents, and a commitment to three different styles within that cluster. But, they have no trained personnel except those already involved.

MR. COLLINS: So there are no new locales where you would move.

MR. WALKER: Was Bruce talking about the extent of the training of all the people in the project or was he narrowing it down to a certain professional group? Part of yesterday's discussion dealt with the professional.

DR. JOYCE: All those responsible for training teachers--cooperating teachers, team leaders, certain university faculty and others. There needs to be professional training of the trainer; it's often beyond the capability of the local project. Teacher Corps will have to marshall good trainers of trainers to support its national effort.

MS. GERALD: A national program to take on the training of the trainers: do you mean Washington would design programs and get people to bring them somewhere? Or would it take place in the local projects?

DR. JOYCE: This recommendation is a post-conference issue, but it should be a national training program; local ones would be uneconomical, but a national program cannot anticipate all local needs. We're talking about basic training of these trainers.

DR. ROYSTER: How do you establish that pool of teacher trainers that you're talking about?

DR. JOYCE: It's a complicated thing...

MR. ENOS: But I would not like to see that training be a rigidifying factor, which I think it can be if it deals with other than process.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: If you go back to you types of school structures, if you go that route, you can have different training for different structures.

MR. ENOS: Right, there isn't one training that fits all. We need options.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: There are some generic things common to all of this.

DR. BUSH: For the record, let's agree that we are not going to rigidify.

MS. GERALD: Recommendation B--"Program for the support of the trainee and for following them up should be provided by the national Teacher Corps office. This program should provide for determining the degree of maladjustment in conventional schools..." I don't quite understand that.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: Some people drop out of Teacher Corps programs during training, and sometimes it's difficult to use what they have been taught in a different school situation in which they might be placed.

Some might be maladjusted and drop out of teaching. Let's study it.

DR. JOYCE: Some of your trainees will be trained in your setting, and things will go well. Then they move to some other place. Let's find out what happens to them; what they are able to do, not able to do--they may be a small group trying to bring about changes.

DR. BUSH: Bunnie, would you say if evidence turns up that trained people eventually get places where they are not able to function, there ought to be changes made? Because if you train people, you ought to train them to be able to work out in the real world, however conventional it might be.

DR. JOYCE: Yes, and conversely, if they are able to function very well, you've found the wheel...

DR. CORRIGAN: Lou Rubin in his seven-year study of inservice training programs, claims the key to whether or not teachers become change agents is the opportunity to be creative in their first experience: and it's the quality of the leadership of the principal that facilitates or inhibits the beginning teacher. If the principal operates an open environment, where teachers and students can realize their potential, they become creative. In their second experience--after a closed first experience--they don't become agents of change to the same degree--even if the second is an open environment.

Is that what we're talking about?

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: The implication of that is: should Teacher Corps go into the training of principals..?

DR. BUSH: Recommendation C: Teacher Corps central ought to provide a comprehensive support service and make it known that when you write your proposal you can also say how you want to use that support service. Yes?

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: Yes.

DR. BUSH: A nice idea. I assume that support service grew out of the needs of the various groups: how do you know ahead of time what support service you are going to need?

DR. GILLIN: Begin from the needs level, to design a program you have people developing needs. The support service would be on tap--various kinds of alternatives to teacher training and the school programs.

DR. BUSH: But you say that the proposal has got to tell how you're going to take advantage of these resources?

DR. JOYCE: There has to be some balance between the maximization of local initiative and the anticipation of local needs. Certain kinds of support services--like skill training--are going to be needed by a lot of people. Design of schools; adjustment to new roles; the process of managing the consortium, help in designing of evaluation schemes are among them.

DR. BILL SMITH: There should be a record in the Office of Education on the support system being established in the programs we developed.

DR. BUSH: Who is going to report on Group B?

MR. ENOS: I'll read it.

We found a lack of explicit models dealing with the theoretical base--human learning theory. We found evaluation was in some cases more judgmental than formative; and the emphasis should be more on documentation than sharing; that the school also was in some ways not terribly influential in the design of the project; that the timeline was restrictive in nature; that there was an articulated notion of not being particularly sensitive either to the child or his culture, or his education; and that there were confining things in the process--where the budget was allocated, who could propose and receive funding, and whether the evaluation came into the project in relation to these things.

We did not formulate a single model. We tried to do some divergent thinking with various models requiring either subversive use of present Teacher Corps guidelines, or change in the way regulations and guidelines are set up.

We looked at a model where the three groups represented would get parity. We have one in which the institute of higher learning, the community and the local school would each send in representation to a policy board in equal numbers, and this becomes the contractor, or the grantee. This is the group that gets the money. They decide then with the help of these local school groups, the direction of the program, and the goals of the program, descriptions, et cetera.

It may be also the delivery system in the needs that arise from the local situation. They choose a director from one of those groups. He or she then works cooperatively with the local school council, composed of school and community personnel. If acceptable to the school, people from the institute of higher learning will participate.

The council determines the philosophical direction of the school, as determined by the community needs.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: The composition of the council is what?

MR. ENOS: Flexible: three to five school personnel (including an administrator, if he happens to be school personnel) and five community members. The administrator could be a community person.

MR. STEFFENSON: Or a university person?

MR. ENOS: Yes.

DR. BUSH: As many as two?

MR. ENOS: The parity idea here would not necessarily include the IHE. It's parity between school and community. It is their school.

We think it legally possible to use present guidelines where one of these two institutions, the grantee or contractoree, might subcontract to this group.

This was the group that determined the direction of the school, and would work Teacher Corps into that setting.

The community decides that Teacher Corps could then work in the local school council with the team leader. IHE and the LEA are in a resource and service capacity to give their input as there is need.

DR. BUSH: By "community" you mean...

MR. ENOS: An Indian reservation...a pocket in a larger system...many things...we're not concerned about how large or how small it might be...

We decided it would be interesting to have the teacher organization or association as the grantee or contractor, who then chose their director, and set up a teacher center with a staff, which includes IHE, LEA and community, and who then through that teacher center become involved in the training of the interns in local schools, which again, are community and school staff organized and developed.

The council at the local school would determine such things as school organization, the learning philosophy, the curricular plan, but the Teacher Center would be the one who delivered whatever the needs were in the training of the interns.

We found lack of planning time constrictive, so we would like the group to consider a one-year contract planning grant. Determining how to evaluate organizational structure, recruitment, and selection in the training of team leaders, and so on. Normally compressed into that very short period just before it opens up, doesn't allow for anything to go on the local school level. We're asking that there be some commitment demonstrated that this is a serious attempt at changing the existing ineffective program. We consider projects to have long range goals, such as certification requirements on a performance base; or reform of the school; these might require up to five years. Those kinds of projects should get the wherewithall not to fail from lack of time.

And informative evaluation design is vital to give feedback to the participants; do not wait until they have made umpteen different mistakes.

There should be an evaluation from an outside agency to see that stated goals are being accomplished according to the timeline.

This evaluation group should be responsible to the larger community, and have the right to cut off that project if--at the end of two years--it is not going anywhere.

DR. BUSH: Now, are you proposing these as alternatives among which the Office should make a choice; or are you making a proposal about the redesigning of the schools?

DR. BILL SMITH: Are you recommending pluralism?

MR. ENOS: Yes; string out the guidelines so that pluralism can exist. Maybe these aren't the three.

DR. CORRIGAN: In all the models we are still committed to school, college, university, community collaboration. It is just that in the model there is a different focus in terms of the contracting agent. Is that true?

DR. BUSH: The new element here is that one of the three-part groups comes to the fore, takes the leadership and has the responsibility.

MR. ENOS: In some, they are an integral part of the business, and in others, they are more of a delivery system as need indicates.

DR. CORRIGAN: Some of the models, looking at them as a system, do not connect. The school person may or may not be on one of the decisionmaking groups or the IHE. We ought to be conscious of systems principles here; people involved in making a system workable and effective must be involved in its development.

If you are developing a delivery system, and leave one of the partners out of a piece of it, you don't have the link. When you accept the linking pin notion of decisionmaking, you've got to have at least one person from the next step in the system to support the communications link--a vital prerequisite to the decisionmaking link. Think about that in building the school, college, community collaborative model.

MR. WALKER: The question of who handles the money carries a problem.

DR. BUSH: On your teacher model, you said give the teachers' association the money--you didn't have any other representation on that at all.

MR. ENOS: They were brought in.

DR. JOYCE: Teacher Corps might well want to experiment with a couple of professional teachers centers. I think that we would want to be very careful not to require a linkage to a university.

DR. BUNNIE SMITH: You spoke of forms of evaluation, departures from existing practice, which is to go through the local education authority, or the university. One mode of control will have effects different from another, and there are second and third order effects that tie into what kids learn in school.

Or never reach that level--but only reach the level of parent satisfaction, community satisfaction, involvement, but make no difference down at the achievement levels.

Shouldn't Teacher Corps administration try alternative centers of control and evaluate them?

MR. ENOS: Formative evaluation means observation to see goals are accomplished, and feedback to change what is wrong with goals not being accomplished.

DR. JOYCE: We have too many multi-hundred-million dollar programs, all differing, in education, not sorted, not collected, not evaluated. We need summative evaluation.

We need to know what effect program variations have. And that may not even be a project responsibility process to know.

MR. MORRISON: I am concerned with group dynamics; what makes coalitions workable.

Some things in some of the models would cause conflict with the operational group, and would conflict with the board policy.

DR. BUSH: Let's move to the planning.

MR. WILLIAMSON: A couple of basic issues have evolved, one concerned outside involvement in planning.

What are the uses of outside people in a caucus? When things are basically up in the air, outside involvement raises more issues, leading to a kind of catharsis.

Now, community involvement, varying relationships, child advocacies, and so forth--it isn't yet clear what priorities those issues have in the Teacher Corps program. We know that they want to be part of these, but we don't know exactly what.

Another kind of participation is more political reaction to, modifications to tentative plans.

A third kind of involvement is really a substantive involvement--you bring outsiders in because you want to share their experience, learn what they know.

Maybe open education and experience based career education are good in their own right and teachers ought to give them visibility and demonstration. And we have school reform and basic, fundamental values.

Another area is models and advances in the techniques of teacher training, the Teacher Corps' history of involvement with teacher education.

Teacher Corps might prioritize, for example, the mutual involvement of community schools and its new higher education.

In that case, the strategy would include programs that demonstrate parity among these groups. Two other areas of interest would then be special competence or permanent and technical assistance that Teacher Corps might be able to give.

We aren't neutral with respect to what communities choose. We do know more than we did 20 years ago, and support programs that demonstrate certain models of teacher training.

You say there ought to be a competency-based teacher education program--then you require that the program demonstrate significant involvement in the community, in higher education and the schools.

Another alternative concerns teacher training in relation to reforming American education.

Teacher Corps needs to be clear where their priorities are: and there are two choices.

Dick Graham expressed the notion of reform movements in American education. Bob Bush made an elegant plea for mutual involvement of community, schools, and institutions of higher education. These are among the fundamental issues that give importance to Teacher Corps, and that's what Teacher Corps really ought to put its emphasis on.

Some people are trying to push open education. Others emphasize CBTE. Each requires different project orientations.

DR. BUSH: Teacher Corps must get together and decide where it's going among these options.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes.

Some of the Teacher Corps staff felt this has been an excellent meeting in raising issues, but we need meetings involving constituencies, to offset the representation problem.

We haven't really heard from community organizers; from teachers' organizations, and so forth. Hence, our issues, problems and solutions are not complete.

You need periods in the future where you're meeting with other groups.

As basic directions and priorities become set, and you become more clear about a tentative general direction, then you bring groups together to reflect the political importance of the situation, begin to build consensus, begin to make sense of the various points of view.

Our fragmented approach, our changing agenda, and continuous cross-fire, have limited such resolution of issues.

The future groups ought to have high representations of both homogeneous and heterogeneous elements so ideas and conflict emerge.

Then basic directions solidify. You bring in Sid Morrison and others with expertise and pump their brains as to what requirements in the guidelines will reflect the best knowledge. Then the planning process probably would have to proceed.

DR. BUSH: Do you see, in going to the broader populations and other groups that we've been working with, the need for more politically-oriented consensus building? For going in with position papers? Or do you go in as we are in this conference, in an agnostic state?

MR. WILLIAMSON: It is the easiest thing in planning to get so far out front that it alienates all the constituencies, largely because there is no feeling of mutual involvement.. And don't let the planning process become some kind of abstract exercise. Teacher Corps has to express its own feelings about its attitude toward planning. It's like motherhood: it's awful to say, "No, we don't believe in planning." I don't fully believe in any long term analysis; if you lay out a timeline for a year and that's not the way people work, or if you don't feel comfortable in systematizing a year ahead, then don't do it. But we need to be aware of the next step, because our process of putting together programs is really one of continual consensus building. This is a very different attitude towards planning.

MR. COLLINS: I think planning is a dynamic, accumulated debt that goes on. You establish a range of considerations to be examined, and an accumulation of data for decisionmaking.

DR. CORRIGAN: You do all that, and the last part of the process would be to design the alternative models.

Now, CBTE became one vehicle through which the school-college collaboration--a Teacher Corps goal--was developed. We're just at the starting point of the next phase--fine tuning that goal.

Some pieces aren't fully developed yet, and we're adding some new pieces. We're talking about school administrators as a possible group in a school-college-community collaborative training model.

Too few training models have brought the school administrator in deep enough to be truly involved.

Now, projects don't go on and on; funding doesn't go on and on. We've had almost ten years of Teacher Corps; but it is a concept vital enough to get funding for another five or ten years.

We can take almost any school reform and try out alternative action models. We can take open education, or CBTE, or we can take career-based education; if it's a big idea, it will test the system more than a small idea will.

Collaboration can continue to be the major goal for Teacher Corps. It's a critical goal in school reform. The education profession needs a model which brings all partners together. Otherwise, we destroy ourselves. The school boards, the unions, the administrators, are all fighting. We need this force, not only to reform the schools, but to keep all the partners in the delivery system working together on specific programs. There is so much more that we have to find out to make the concept of "mutuality" work. That can be the major contribution of Teacher Corps in the days ahead.

So, we have some positive pieces, and we've talked about some dangers. We might assume we have developed a system--a working operation. We really haven't but we're beginning to learn how.

MR. MORRISON: A lot of positive things came out.

Our original design had principals in the project design phase--that's really good--it deals with school conditions.

At the beginning, I felt surrounded by Teacher Corps people. I have come to see that the people on the staff are really open and the goals are valid.

MS. MAHONEY: What did you mean when you said that a planning system could get to be a mechanical exercise?

MR. WILLIAMSON: We start finding ourselves bringing out position papers, and developing models. But there's a danger: it can grow, before very long, to have nothing to do with real people; we can get way ahead--our papers can take off but not mean anything real to those who will implement our plans.

DR. BUSH: Gentlemen, I have to begin wrapping up this conference--with all too much left to thrash out.

DR. BILL SMITH: I just want to say that we certainly have appreciated all the players, the professional staff, and the visitors. For myself, I began at the issue level, as you know from the introduction. Now having read lengthy documents on diffusion and adoption, we know we've got to go through those first stages of issue-raising and problem-identification. Teachers, parents, and the like--you've brought the group much wisdom from experience, personal commitment, and integrity.

Bob Bush can say, "Well, you guys very systematically locked out my chance to input, because you made me the chairman.

But, as we all know, he contributed much--and impartially. Next time, Mr. Chairperson, you will not be the chairperson, but a full participant, creating alternatives, ideas, and input.

But since you did chair the conference, let me commend you for masterful handling of many critical issues and for bringing to birth products that exceed the expectations that we had.

DR. BUSH: Thank you.

DR. BILL SMITH: You will receive a summary document of the conference proceedings, but more important, we hope that you will elaborate on some of the issues and help us think through some additional dimensions, even before we start talking about other kinds of conferences.

So, once again, it has really been very helpful.

(Whereupon, the conference was adjourned.)